The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1895.

The Week.

THE vote in the House on Thursday on the gold-bond resolution was primarily and essentially a heavy blow to the public credit; yet it has been treated as if it were merely a rebuff for President Cleveland. "Beaten again!" cries the exultant *Tribune*, dancing with the other wreckers on the shore where they hope to see the national credit dashed to pieces. No matter if we turn out a nation of defaulters, provided Cleveland is not allowed to have his way. Reduced to its simplest terms, that seems to have been the main motive in the minds of the members who voted to throw away $16,000,000 and further shock and estrange the confidence of the financial world. If the President urged them to be sane and honest, that made plain their duty to play the harlequin and the cheat. This is really about the greatest compliment that could be paid to Mr. Cleveland. Scarce another President has had the good fortune so to identify his own personality with national honor and financial stability as to make all enemies of the public credit *ipso facto* his enemies. Nor has he any reason whatever to care for their raging. He is master of the situation, and all the howling of the jackals cannot alter the fact that he is both able and determined to maintain the Government's plighted faith. While his personal enemies and the bat-eyed partisans are shrieking out "Beaten Again," the country is thanking its stars that he is not beaten, and that its honor and stability are safe in his hands.

Politically, Thursday's vote was chiefly significant as revealing an alarming division in the Republican party. Even under Mr. Reed's urging, but 31 Republican votes were secured for the bill, while 63 were cast against it. With 89 Democrats voting in the affirmative and 94 against, little is left to choose between parties. When the Duke of Kent visited the Dey of Algiers in 1818, the latter potentate, in an effort to be complimentary, said: "Your father is the greatest pirate in the world, but I am the next." The Western Republicans in like manner admit that the Democrats have gone further than they have for cheap money and broken credit, but they are doing their best to come in a close second. But, says Presidential candidate Reed, the Republicans of the East and the West have always found some way to get along together, and they will now. Not until some way of making fifty cents equal a dollar shall be discovered. There is now every sign of an irrepressible conflict in the Republican party on the money question. The bold talk and votes of the Western Republicans on Thursday are the first move in an aggressive campaign to nominate, if not an outright free-silver Republican candidate for the Presidency, at least a flabby and wabbling candidate. Mr. Reed will find himself consumed between two fires. The Western men will not have a leader whom a telegram from Boston bankers can make turn a complete summersault in two weeks. The Eastern men will not have him if, as the next Speaker, he appoints a shaky committee on coinage. There can be no good-Lord good-devil leadership in this currency matter.

We do not think that American history records the existence of a more brutish Congress than the one now sitting at Washington, or one that the people will be more glad to see dispersed till the day of judgment. The majority of its members are utterly at variance with public opinion touching the recent loan by which a suspension of specie payments was averted. They do not know what the people are saying and thinking about them. The truth is, that the President is sustained by nine-tenths of the business men and of the thinking men throughout the country. These men make public opinion. They constitute public opinion. If there was any way by which the vote of Massachusetts, for example, could be taken to-day on the question of sustaining the President, he would receive an enormous majority. It is only because no such vote can be taken that the wretched Lodge dares to throw *camouflets* at him, and the wretched Gorman to insult him by introducing a bill to annul a clause of the contract which he has made with the bond syndicate. This is the clause which gives the syndicate the first chance until next October to subscribe for a new issue if another one should be necessary. Gorman's amendment proposes to authorize the issue of 3 per cent. exchequer bills to the amount of $100,000,000, to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue—a measure entirely proper in itself, but he has added a provision that all future bond sales shall be made in pursuance of public advertisement, in the teeth of an existing contract made by the secretary of the treasury with the President's approval, and officially communicated to Congress. In other words, Gorman wants the President to cancel and repudiate his own contract. Of course he will not do so, even at the risk of losing an appropriation bill.

Senator Sherman exhibited himself on Monday as a stickler for forms, when he insisted that the negotiation of loans was the work of the secretary of the treasury and not of the President. This question involves an interpretation of the Constitution. There is nothing which takes the management of the finances out of the scope of the clause of the Constitution which says that the President shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed. Every law of Congress must be interpreted with this provision in view. This whole question was fought out during Jackson's administration and was decided in the forum of public opinion, then and since, in favor of the President's power to direct what the secretary of the treasury shall do—not to compel him to violate the law, but to control him within the limits of the law. The law at that time authorized the secretary, in his discretion, to remove the public deposits from the Bank of the United States, requiring him merely to give his reasons for doing so to Congress. President Jackson desired that Secretary Duane should remove the deposits, but he refused to do so. He also refused to resign his office. Accordingly the President removed him and appointed another secretary who did remove them. It was the great question of the day. It overshadowed everything else in politics for the space of six years. It was not a question that could come before the courts in any way. It was one to be decided by the people at the polls, and they decided it in favor of the President at every opportunity they had for voting upon it until the other side abandoned the field. If there were any such opportunity now, they would vote as they did then. It stands to reason that if the President has the power to remove a secretary (which is not denied), he has the power to direct what the secretary shall do within the limits of the law.

Secretary Carlisle's statement regarding the condition of the Treasury reveals the fact that there has been an actual contraction of the currency during the past twelve months of nearly $80,000,000. On January 1, 1894, the amount of United States notes and Treasury notes held in the Treasury was $6,289,086; on January 31, 1895, the amount was $85,627,989. All these millions of the people's precious money locked up out of their reach! Why, this is twice the amount of greenbacks that Secretary McCulloch retired. It was something terrible for him to do it, and the law authorizing it had to be repealed. A contraction of the currency could not be thought of without shivers. It cannot now by the *Tribune*. But here is a contraction of $80,000,000 which has gone on unperceived and unfelt, while the really great financiers of Congress and the newspapers have been straining every nerve to prevent anything of the kind. Yet these men will go on just as firm as ever in the belief that their mothers bore Solons.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG.
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Alabama lawmakers have finally concluded that it is better to save the State $100,000 a year in interest on the public debt than to "vindicate" silver. The lower branch of the Legislature recently insisted upon striking out from a Senate refunding bill a clause providing that the new bonds should be made payable in gold instead of coin, although it was conceded by all that 1 per cent. in interest could thus be saved, and although it was found two years ago that new bonds could not be placed at a lower rate than the old ones without this provision. The only excuse given for their attitude by the Representatives who opposed the gold clause was the assertion that it would "put the people of Alabama in gold shackles." The Senators were not moved by this plea, and insisted upon the gold provision, and the House on Friday, on second thought, concurred by the close vote of 42 to 40. The Alabama Legislature thus puts to shame the example of Congress, which has just refused to save the nation half a million dollars a year for the next thirty years in the same way.

The House members of the conference committee on the diplomatic appropriation bill refuse to accede to the demand of the Senate for the insertion of an item appropriating $500,000 to begin work on a cable between the United States and the Hawaiian Islands. It is to be hoped that they will stand firm. The advocates of the scheme ask only $500,000 now, but they estimate that the total cost of the line would be at least $3,000,000, and all experience goes to indicate that it would turn out to be a great deal more. The reason they are urgent about the $500,000 is that the appropriation of this sum would commit the Government to carrying the project through. There is no possible excuse for borrowing money to lay a cable that we do not need, and there is no public sentiment in favor of such foolish extravagance. The people will sustain the House in blocking this job.

The Senate committee on the subject has again made an unfavorable report on the resolution which has passed the House for the submission of a constitutional amendment providing that Senators shall be elected by the people, instead of by the Legislatures. No matter how large a majority such a proposition may secure in the lower branch, most of the Senators will oppose it, although it is not without advocates in that branch. Two motives conspire to array the Senate in the negative. One is the natural conservatism of that body, which prejudices it against any change of methods, and especially so radical a change as is here proposed. The whole force of tradition and precedent is on the side of the existing system. The strong argument which may be made for it by high constitutional authorities, like ex-Senator Edmunds in his recent article in the *Forum*, is reinforced by the practical objections to a change of not a few Senators, who have succeeded in getting elected by a Legislature, but doubt whether they would be as fortunate if they submitted their claims directly to the people, as a man must do who asks a nomination from the State convention of his party.

Mr. Everett made a brief but eloquent appeal to the House at Washington on Friday, the 15th inst., to pay the just claims on us—adjudged to be just by the Court of Claims and the committee on claims—to increase the absurdly small salaries of our higher officials, especially of our ambassadors and ministers abroad, and of our cabinet ministers and our judges, before spending an enormous sum in battle-ships. He pointed out further that the enemy that is lying in wait for us "is not Great Britain or France; it is not Austria or Chili. That enemy—that foreign enemy, that un-American enemy—is in our great cities. The foreign enemy we have to dread is planted in the streets of our great cities—your city and mine. There is the problem for us. There is what demands the expenditure of our surplus." He spoke also of the way in which the public mind is being familiarized with the idea of war by the constant use by our public men of such phrases as "in case of war," "in the event of war." From hearing them talk, one might get the idea that we were a little state like Switzerland or Denmark, surrounded by mighty enemies eager to dismember us or get a whack at us, or had, like Germany, a powerful enemy on our border burning for revenge, by launching half a million of men across our frontier. So far has this gone that many people now think of the expansion of our commerce as chiefly interesting as a probable cause of war. Even the Nicaragua Canal attracts many solely as something to fight England about. They would not care a straw for it as a neutral highway of commerce, but as a probable cause of hostilities with some European power they chuckle over it. The cause of this strange, semi-barbaric state of mind is undoubtedly—apart from the love of combats and fights which always prevails among youths—the tendency of patriotism, like everything else, to move in the line of least resistance or trouble. True and large patriotism would demand a diligent, unflinching solution of all the tremendous domestic problems which beset us, in finance, in administration, and in legislation. But such solution would make heavy inroads on the time, patience, labor, self-restaint, and money of every man of us. Consequently, we naturally prefer to show our patriotism by hiring men, mostly foreigners, to get up spectacular fights for us in big ships on the sea, which will make us glow without risk and sell our "extras."

Ex-Senator Edmunds made some excellent points in his argument against the constitutionality of the income tax before the United States Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia on Thursday. He said the tax divided the community into two classes, one of which paid and the other did not. But if Congress had the power to tax people with incomes of over $4,000, and let those who had incomes under that amount escape, why had it not the power to tax people with incomes under $4,000, and let those who had more escape? If Congress did this, what should we say? Also, would a tariff act be constitutional which allowed persons to import goods worth less than $100,000 in the aggregate free of duty, while making all who imported more than that amount pay heavily? The want of uniformity is, in fact, the most serious objection to the tax on which the highest court has not yet passed. The Supreme Court has, however, found that at the foundation of the Government the only direct taxes known were the land tax and the capitation tax. The income tax was not thought of until long after. It has, therefore, concluded that these were the only direct taxes that could be known to the Constitution, and that any other direct tax that might be concocted must, for constitutional purposes, be called by some other name, and be treated as indirect. The question, it says, is one of nomenclature, not of fact. The income tax is the directest direct tax the wit of man could devise. Every tax that a man has to pay which he cannot evade by failure or refusal to do or leave undone, to purchase or to use, is a direct tax. So say the lexicographers, so say the economists, so say the people who invented the language and express themselves in it. But the Supreme Court says—Not so; that may be the meaning of "direct" for all other purposes of life; for the purpose of taxation in the United States, "direct" must be held to mean "indirect." Those who think differently have not "legal minds." Every government has and must have the power, not only to issue paper money, but to stamp words with a legal as distinguished from the popular meaning, and raise money thereunder.

A correspondent writes to us:

"Supposing the predatory income tax to be declared constitutional, will you kindly tell your readers what steps the Government would be obliged to take to collect it, and what you think its success would be if persons liable to pay the tax generally possessed enough of the old tea-party spirit to ignore it? I understand that a great many propose to try the experiment."

There is no doubt that the income tax has been imposed for predatory purposes, that is, for the purpose of compelling one set of people to bear the burdens of another set of people. But nevertheless it is law, and consequently a general refusal to pay it would be anarchical and a direct encouragement to anarchy. It is true it is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an attack on property, but then the only guarantee we have for the security of any property at all is the readiness of the people to obey even laws of which they disapprove. If we were to allow ourselves to select from the statute-book the enactments which we would treat as binding, and disregard the others, the confusion would be frightful and the state would not long hold together. It is quite true that occasions may arise when disobedience to law becomes a duty, but they can arise in a free country only when there is no hope of repeal or legal redress. When we see how frequently popular opinions vary and power passes from one party to another in America, we should have to be very despondent indeed in order to conclude that the income tax would be perpetual. We, too, who voted to put the Democrats in power must stand up like men and take our medicine. Nobody in this part of the country who voted for them had the smallest idea that they had an income tax in their pockets, for they took care not to mention it. They played a trick on us, but we have no right now to upset the Government to atone for our own credulity. The work before us is to try to get the Republicans to abolish the tax, as the most effective tool ever put in the hands of anarchists, socialists, Populists, and money cranks of every description. We say all this on the supposition that the Supreme Court will again declare it constitutional. It has already declared it constitutional by using the term "direct tax" in a sense unknown to the philologists, to the people, and to economists, which is in itself a dangerous thing. If we cannot tie courts up to the dictionary, we are at the mercy of judges.

Accounts differ as to the number of brave men who obeyed Platt's call for a council of war at the Fifth Avenue Hotel on Sunday, but we are disposed to be liberal and accept the highest number given, thirteen, including Platt and his son, as the accurate total. There were some notable absences, but the determined spirit of those who were present atoned for the poverty in numbers. "Every voice was for war," we are assured by Mr. Platt's favorite organ, and "it was agreed that the time for conciliatory measures with Mayor Strong had passed." The causes of the war were clearly stated. Mr. Lauterbach, chairman of the Platt Republican county committee, informed the council of war that he had in person twice asked the mayor to appoint a certain man to office, stating each time that the candidate was endorsed by the county committee, and that the mayor had replied each time that he could not appoint the man, because he had some one else for the place. Mr. Lauterbach said it was evident from this conduct that the mayor did not intend to "recognize" the Republican county committee, and every man of the thirteen said to himself through closed teeth when he heard the story, "This means war." What form the war should take was settled upon without delay. The war cry is to be: "No more reform till we get some offices!" The plan of war is for Mr. Platt to go in person to Albany and take charge of the Legislature. Every bill which embodies reform for New York city is to be "held up," and its passage refused, till the mayor consents to give some offices to the Platt men.

Nothing is more remarkable among the crowds who surround Mayor Strong in the city hall every day than their simplicity. They are evidently largely from the country, are much more respectable in appearance than the old Tammany gang, and are all in dead earnest. But the mayor's promise of non-partisanship has evidently made no impression on them. They rely as much as ever on good Republican work and fidelity, and believe he will recognize all such claims. But what is oddest in their beliefs is the notion that the mayor gives offices to people he knows nothing about, without much inquiry or consideration, on applications made in this way in the chair at his side. They suppose that if they can see him with a good introduction, they will probably get something that has not been promised to any one else. No better illustration of the way the spoils system has worked into the popular mind could be given than the scene in his room on the receipt of the power-of-removal bill. The attraction of a public place even on a small salary is evidently very great. Why it is so great would furnish an interesting topic for sociological speculation.

The Harvard faculty have followed President Eliot's lead in voting that intercollegiate football ought to be abolished. This action will be communicated to the athletic committee, a university body in its composition, and may or may not be given effect by them. Three out of the nine members being undergraduates, it would seem as if a majority in favor of the existing custom were more probable than the reverse. In that case, we shall be likely to witness another futile attempt to "reform" the game. There is, however, a strong disposition on the part of football-players of distinction at Harvard to confine the game to college grounds, with only college people for spectators; and this would be a decided gain on the moral side. Nevertheless, we adhere to our oft-repeated conviction that the simple solution of the whole athletic problem lies in concentrating the interest of each college upon home sports, without regard to, or competition or contact with, any other college. We do not separate football from other team play when we condemn all intercollegiate contests as demoralizing, and as tending to substitute physical for spiritual ideals in the aim and intent of college discipline. Football is simply more brutal and more perilous.

The announcement that the Yale "*Lit.*" prize would not be awarded this year because not one of the essays handed in was worthy of such recognition, must give something of a shock to the older graduates of that institution, coming, too, so soon after the comments made on Yale's uninterrupted defeats in the debating contests with Harvard. In the early sixties, a freshman on entering Yale had pointed out to him as the college heroes the great debaters of the two old open societies. To-day even those societies are dead, and the freshman has pointed out to him the champion slugger at football, the highest jumper, and the furthest thrower of the hammer. Even the champion oarsman takes a second place in these days of higher athletics. Friends of the college who protest against this state of things, however, are "jumped on."

An English paper lately published what it called an "Ambassadorial Number," consisting largely of interviews with the diplomats residing near the Court of St. James's. The theme upon which their views were solicited was international peace. Diverse opinions were discovered as to its possibility and its foundations. Mr. Bayard spoke at some length upon the many reasons why the closest friendship should exist between his country and England, and thought commerce afforded the best and firmest basis for peaceful international relations. This shows what antiquated and absurd ideas our minister to England is still afflicted with. True, he agrees with the fathers of the republic and the framers of the Constitution, he has the same idyllic notions as Franklin and Paine and Jefferson and Hamilton; but it is pitiful to find him unaware how we have changed all that. One Senate debate, one lecture before a "war college," one editorial in a really great newspaper, would have been enough to inform him that, in the modern world, commerce is the greatest and direst promoter of war. Every cargo of foreign goods landed here is little better than an insult, while buying wheat or mutton of Argentina is practically tantamount to a declaration of war. Has Mr. Bayard never heard of the impending great war and its cause? Doesn't he know that our foreign commerce is going to provoke England to such insensate fury that she will begin firing on our merchantmen, and that, therefore, we, on our part, must have some big ships ready and begin firing on her merchantmen first? All our schoolboys know these elementary truths of statecraft, and it is depressing to find Mr. Bayard ignorant of them. The Brazilian minister showed to great advantage, compared with him, by roundly saying of international peace that it was "a myth." The Chinese ambassador seemed to agree with the American, that peace is to the mutual benefit of nations; but *his* reasons for praising peace are a little too obvious just now.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR. SHERMAN'S BLACK CONTRACTS.

SENATOR LODGE proved again, on Saturday, the easy superiority of an educated man over blatherskites in their own specialty. After the mining-camp Senators had poured out their vituperation on the President for saving the public credit, the cultured son of Harvard distanced them all by saying of the bond-contract: "It is on its face the blackest public contract ever made by the Government of the United States." On Monday the cry was taken up by Senator Sherman. He left the blackness and the blackguardism to Lodge, and contented himself with calling the contract "faulty and improvident." This suggests an inquiry as to the nature of the contracts which he himself made as secretary of the treasury. What were they and what was said of them at the time?

The details are all set forth in the volume published by the Government in 1880 on 'Specie Resumption and Refunding of the National Debt.' One has only to read it to discover that essentially the same difficulties confronted the Treasury then as embarrass it now, and that essentially the same measures were chosen to surmount them. The arguments that make out Carlisle's contract black, make out Sherman's blacker.

The first argument which Lodge and his fellows use is, that the Treasury has put itself in the power of foreigners. The Jews have us on the hip. But then what are the names of the "parties of the second part" in the contracts made by Secretary Morrill in 1876 and Secretary Sherman in 1877 and 1878? Why, they are the dreadful names at the sound of which every true American starts in horror, unless he is in a position where he must get a loan—the names of Rothschild, Seligman, Raphael, Kuhn, Loeb, Hoffmann, and others as ominous. On April 12, 1878, the following cable message was received at the Treasury in Washington, than which, as the orators say, nothing more damning ever appeared in a Government publication:

> "Very pleased we have entered into relations again with American Government. Shall do our best to make the business successful.
> "ROTHSCHILDS."

What a splitting of throats and cracking of ear-drums there would be over such a message now—the Jew firm gloating over a victimized secretary!

The second argument to show the exceeding blackness of the Carlisle contract is the fact that it gives the syndicate an option on all bonds that may be issued up to next October. If this makes the Carlisle contract black, it makes the Morrill and Sherman contracts blacker. Those documents gave the wicked foreign syndicate not an option, but an "exclusive right" to subscribe for further bonds. As a matter of fact, on two occasions Mr. Sherman had offers for several millions of bonds at better figures than the syndicate would give. He was obliged to decline them on the ground that the syndicate had a monopoly. This makes a mere option look positively white.

Finally, say or shriek the blatherskites, the syndicate is going to make an enormous amount of money. This is what worries Mr. Sherman. Selling a bond at 104 which may soon be placed at 118 or 120 is too much for him. Senator Gray forcibly retorts that the great Ohio trimmer really makes the favorable situation created by the prompt action of the Treasury the ground for condemning it. If the action had not been taken, no bonds could have been sold at any price. The nation was only three days away from bankruptcy. Owing to that emergency, and by surmounting it, the bankers were able to make a profit out of their investment. This is a sufficient answer on general principles. But a better answer to Senator Sherman is of the *tu quoque* sort. If it is "faulty and improvident" to sell a 4 bond at 104, with the prospect of seeing it quoted at 118, what is it to sell a 4 per cent. bond at 100, only to have it quoted in a few years at 126?

Senator Sherman dwells in an even more fragile glass house than this. He admits that the motives and the character of Secretary Carlisle are beyond suspicion. Was the same said of him in 1877–'79? Has he forgotten the ugly talk in those years about "Fort Sherman"? Has he no memory for congressional inquiries, for demands for a list of commissions paid (and they mounted up into the millions), for the complaints about double interest allowed favored banks, and, in particular, for the charge that he had practically handed over a clean $1,000,000 of profits to a single bank in this city? Has he no recollection of the talk of indicting or impeaching him? In an interview in the *Tribune* of December 25, 1878, Mr. Sherman admitted that the banks had made huge profits out of the exercise of his discretion in making them refunding agents. Is he the man to lead off in railing accusations against his successor in office? It is safe to say that no charges of personal dishonesty will be made against Secretary Carlisle in the New York Republican platform of 1895, such as were made against Senator Sherman, by implication, in the New York Democratic platform of 1879.

For our part, we never credited those charges for an instant. We saw in Senator Sherman's resumption and refunding operations a great service to the country performed with great skill and in the face of great difficulties. But those operations were substantially similar to the one just closed by the present Administration. The Treasury was in urgent need of gold, and had then as now to turn to the men who had it. The gold had to be taken then as now on the terms of the men who were asked to part with it, not on the terms of the men who were in desperate straits for lack of it. Then as now contracts had to be made which were onerous, which yielded a good profit to the bankers, but which also resulted in great savings to the Government, and which secured the aid of the financial world in sustaining the good faith of this nation. In 1877 and in 1878 the syndicate undertook to control the rates of sterling exchange just as they do now.

In all this we see nothing but what is proper and patriotic. Nor is it surprising that the wolves should open in full cry on the contract of 1895 just as they did on those of 1877 and 1878. But the thing that is surprising, that is outrageous and intolerable, is to find this particular old gray wolf now leading the pack. Blackguardism must needs come, and blatherskites there will always be; but to see the blackguarded of 1878 turn blackguards in 1895, to find Lodge, Sherman, and the *Tribune* among the blatherskites—these things cannot overcome us without our special wonder.

A NEW SILVER CONFERENCE.

IT is the common belief of those who are not making as much money as they have made at some time heretofore, that the trouble is in the currency, and that if the money question could be overhauled and rearranged, good times would return. The half-truths of the silverites on this subject are very specious. They tell us that one-half of the money in the world has been struck out of existence since 1873, and that the great decline in prices must be due to that circumstance. It is assumed without argument that a resolution passed by an international monetary conference would restore the other half and put prices up again; that an advance of prices would be a good thing for the human race; and that it is possible to get an international agreement of this kind, although three attempts have been made and have failed.

During recent years there has been a great deal of unrest in Germany, especially in the Agrarian party (the land-owning class), in consequence of the decline in the prices of wheat and rye. The decline has been really due to very large crops produced in the United States, Russia, and Argentina, and to the commercial treaties with Germany's eastern and southern neighbors which have admitted their cereals at reduced rates of duty. But the silverites ignore all these things, and tell the exasperated land-owners that it is all due to the demonetization of silver. The Government, which has incurred savage hostility by reason of the relaxation of tariffs against Russia and Austria, is not sorry to see the blame shifted to some other quarter for a while. For this reason it fell in with the proposal of the Agrarians last year to have a commission to make a fresh inquiry into the silver question. When a government is in trouble on the bread-and-butter conditions of life, a commission is always in order. It takes time, it gives

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a chance for some new excitement to swamp the old one, and it lets off superfluous steam.

The silver commission of last year made a report which was not satisfactory to the Agrarians, and they have now made a push for a new international silver conference. As this will fill up the time for a year or two, and give a chance for something else to happen, the Government does not oppose it, and even favors it in a guarded way. Accordingly the Reichstag votes for it by a large majority. The Socialists, the Catholics, and the small remnant of the German Liberals oppose the movement because they consider it a "false scent," but they are not sufficiently numerous to stop it. So we may assume that the fourth silver conference is in prospect. At all events, it is in shape to be talked about. A few words on the subject of the previous ones are therefore in order.

The first was called at the instance of the United States, and met at Paris August 16, 1878. All the great Powers of Europe except Germany, and most of the lesser ones, took part in it. The conference remained in session till August 29. On the day before the adjournment the European delegates, except those of Italy, joined in a collective answer to the propositions of the United States saying: (1) that it is necessary to maintain in the world the monetary function of silver as well as of gold, but that the selection of one or the other, or both simultaneously, should be governed by the special situation of each state or group of states; (2) that the question of the restriction of the coinage of silver should be equally left to the discretion of each state or group of states; (3) that the differences of opinion which have appeared exclude the discussion of the adoption of a common ratio between the two metals. The representatives of the United States dissented from these conclusions. Thereupon the conference adjourned *sine die*.

The second conference was held at the instance of France and the United States. It met in Paris, April 19, 1881. In this conference Germany and British India participated, in addition to the countries represented in that of 1878. It remained in session till July 8, having taken one intermission from May 19 to June 30. No conclusion was reached and no vote was taken on the main question. The conference adjourned to April 12, 1882, but never reassembled.

The third conference assembled at the instance of the President (not of the Congress) of the United States, at the city of Brussels, November 22, 1892. The same powers were represented as before, with Turkey, Rumania, and Mexico added. It remained in session till December 17, when it adjourned, without taking any action, to May 30, 1893, but did not reassemble at that date or at any other time. In this it followed the valuable precedent of the conference of 1881.

Of course, if there is to be another conference, we shall take part in it, but we hope that President Cleveland will not join in calling it. We have taken the initiative in three conferences, and have been punished by seeing them dissolve in vapor and "pass noiseless out of sight." Now let some other country take the head of the class, or stand on the dunce-block, as the case may be. There is no reason to suppose that a new conference would result differently from the three that have gone before; but if the Powers of Europe want to take silver into their currencies again, we shall be very glad to supply them with all they need.

WEBSTER AND THE WAR SPIRIT.

Of all the addresses made in Congress at the recent presentation of Webster's statue, none was more effective, oratorically, than that of Representative Everett. If the note of eulogy was too unqualified, this might be forgiven one who spoke, as he admitted he did, "to pay a debt of hereditary gratitude." What he said of Webster's services in the peaceful settlement of international difficulties was most just and timely, and a tribute to a great man which needs no color from personal friendship. He referred particularly to the dispute over the Maine boundary, when the hotheads were calling for war. "Throughout the country and all along the frontier fiery spirits were eager to rush to arms." Said Mr. Everett:

> "Suppose Mr. Webster had caught up that sentiment; suppose that, when Sir Robert Peel suggested the hope of a compromise line and sent a special envoy, Mr. Webster had refused the proposal; had defied Sir Robert Peel and Lord Ashburton; had appealed to the war spirit of the country from Maine to Louisiana; had launched the yeomanry and chivalry of the Union simultaneously across the St. Croix, the St. Lawrence, the Columbia, and the Sabine; had sent the *Princeton* on her first cruise to open against the English that deep-mouthed ordnance which was to prove so fatal to his own successor. Why, at the end of Mr. Tyler's administration, he might have floated into the White House, triumphantly borne on waves of blood, as the great war secretary! A more brilliant prospect of glory rarely offers itself to Republican statesmen. Mr. Webster knew better. He knew that the torch of war as it sweeps over kindred nations, however it may dazzle or may warm at the moment, leaves behind it a terrible train of woe. Not merely the wounds and deaths of thousands who can ill be spared to their country; not merely blasted fields and ruined families; not merely the cost of millions, which a peace of tenfold duration can hardly repair, but the rankling passions and unsatiated vengeance of mighty nations, which God made to live together in unity, peace, and concord."

Webster negotiated a treaty and accepted a boundary line which brought upon him the denunciations of all that was ignorant and base in the land. His successors in the State Department have heard the like. With it he obtained the first extradition treaty, and gained the force of precedent for methods of peace, which has been an incalculable blessing to our country.

This was all the greater a service and triumph from the fact that Webster himself had a little of the Jingo in him. His famous letter to Austria, in the Hülsemann case, had a good deal of the Philistine snort about it. He reminded Francis Joseph that the possessions of the house of Hapsburg were "but as a patch on the earth's surface" compared to the region over which the power of the United States extended. To his friend Ticknor he privately confessed that the letter was "boastful and rough," but gave as his excuse that he wanted to "tell the people of Europe who and what we are," and "to write a paper which should touch the national pride and make a man feel sheepish and look silly who should speak of disunion." But in the crisis of the boundary dispute he stood firm for diplomatic adjustment and mutual concessions, despite the craze for war which was sweeping through the States.

Mr. Everett mentioned no contemporary names or tendencies, leaving it to his hearers and readers to make their own comparisons. But there is little doubt that he was moved to his eloquent account of Webster's services to the cause of peace by the reviving and senseless war spirit of our own day. The number of men in private or public life who are now mad to fight somebody is appalling. Navy officers dream of war and talk and lecture about it incessantly. The Senate debates are filled with predictions of impending war and with talk of preparing for it at once. With the country under the necessity of the most stringent economy, appropriations of $12,000,000 for battle-ships are urged upon Congress, not because we need them now, but because we shall need them "in the next great war." Most truculent and bloodthirsty of all, the Jingo editors keep up a din, day after day, about the way we could cripple one country's fleet and destroy another's commerce, and fill the heads of boys and silly men with the idea that war is the normal state of a civilized country.

The only qualification these warriors of the pen make in their praise of war is that it must be defensive. Somebody is to try to get the better of us, or impose upon us, or bully us, and then we are to rise in the majesty of a free people and sup full on horrors. But the curious thing is, that this is precisely what all fighting nations say. Not one of them would think for an instant of an aggressive or unjust war. Not one of them would be guilty of violating a single principle of international law or even courtesy. They are all perfect gentlemen, and it is the other fellow who is going to act like a rowdy and get a good drubbing for it. Now, if they were all honest in these professions, there would be no need of building another man-of-war. If no international aggression is to be committed, or act of injustice done, there will never be a war. As M. Novikoff forcibly points out in his vivacious little book on 'La Guerre et ses Prétendus Bienfaits,' this praise of a purely defensive war and determination to embark in no other is suicidal. If that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were all that was contemplated, modern armaments would be unknown; they are really got together for use in making might equal right. If the aggression of the other party is not forthcoming, it will be imagined, and that will do as well.

But, even for a defensive war, it is as little worth the while of a civilized nation to prepare as it is for a civilized man to prepare to equal at fisticuffs the ruffian who, for all he knows, may tread on his toes or pull his beard in the next street. It is, indeed, significant that all the arguments in favor of war used to be employed in favor of duelling and preparing for the duello. A man must not be helpless when insulted. He must give as good as he got, and learn to be handy with pistol and sword. Everybody knows that such training simply multiplied insults and encounters, and anybody can see that the same effects will follow the habit of preparing for an international duello. The civilized man does not, as Lord Brougham did, step out into the street and fight with a navvy who insults him; he hands the man over to the police. A civilized nation may do the same. International law, peaceful arbitration, the growth of the moral sense in nations, constitute the police to which a quarrelsome and aggressive country may be turned over. They make up a power which no nation can safely defy, and in which a dignified and self-respecting people may as securely trust as may the individual in the protection of the courts.

ELEMENTARY INSTRUCTION.

It is but little more than a year since a committee of ten, with President Eliot of Harvard at their head, submitted to the National Educational Association a report dealing with secondary-school studies, and with the relations which ought to exist between the schools and the colleges. The good effects of that report, and of the study and discussion that it stimulated, are still being felt throughout the country. Perhaps no single educational document has ever excited so much attention, and provoked so much controversy, as that now famous report of the Committee of Ten.

But it covered only a portion of the field of education, and the most pressing problems that grow out of the needs of the vast system of elementary schools remained for separate treatment. These were referred to a second committee, of fifteen members, presided over by Superintendent Maxwell of Brooklyn. This committee was constituted early in 1893, and its report has just been published. The members of the committee were the superintendents of schools in the cities of Brooklyn, Boston, Philadelphia, Chicago, Kansas City, St. Paul, Cleveland (O.), Providence (R. I.), Springfield (Mass.), Peoria, Galveston, and Washington, together with the State superintendent of schools in New Jersey, President Draper of the University of Illinois, and Dr. William T. Harris, the United States commissioner of education. A committee of more experienced and representative men could hardly be found.

This Committee of Fifteen, after two years of investigation and deliberation, has submitted an elaborate report on three topics: the training of teachers, the correlation of studies in elementary education, and the organization of city school systems. This report was laid before the Department of Superintendence of the National Educational Association, in session at Cleveland on February 19–21, and there discussed. It will now take the same course as the report of the Committee of Ten, and become matter of debate among teachers, boards of education, and intelligent citizens in all parts of the country.

On the subject of the training of teachers the committee speaks with no uncertain sound. It is insisted that a high-school education is an essential part of the equipment of an elementary-school teacher, and that a college education is necessary to fit a high-school teacher for his work. On the basis of the scholarship thus gained the strictly professional training must be carried on. This is held to include the study of psychology as a basis for principles and methods, of methodology as a guide to instruction; of school economy, which adjusts the conditions of work; and of the history of education, which gives breadth of view. The training is to include also observation of good teaching, and practice-teaching under supervision and criticism. It may perhaps be objected that all this is a matter of course. It ought to be, but unfortunately it is not. Even in New York city and in Brooklyn hundreds of teachers are given licenses and appointments on the basis of an examination alone, no professional training being necessary. In other and better-governed cities it has become customary for progressive schoolboards to put into their by-laws a provision requiring that all applicants for teachers' licenses must have spent some time in a normal school, city training-school, or pedagogical department of a college. It is hardly conceivable that so clear and logically reasoned a statement as the Committee of Fifteen makes on this point, will not lead to a general improvement throughout the country in this vital matter of professionally trained teachers.

The second part of the report treats of the correlation of studies, and is from the pen of Dr. Harris. While very valuable in many ways, and susceptible of being used to great advantage, it is disappointing in that it almost completely ignores what many teachers believe to be the really important element in correlation. The practical situation in which the elementary school finds itself is this: The rapid and increasingly complex development of the demands of modern life has added largely to the burdens of the school. More must be taught, both in quality and in quantity, than was formerly the case. The time remains as limited as it ever was. The real problem of correlation lies in the possibility of so treating the several school studies that they will become mutually dependent, occupy less time than when treated as independent wholes, and coöperate together to make what the followers of Herbart are fond of calling educative, or character-building, instruction. This point of view is evidently not acceptable to Dr. Harris, but a strong plea is made for it in the dissenting statements of Superintendent Gilbert of St. Paul and Superintendent Jones of Cleveland. The value of this portion of the report consists in its full and careful analysis of the studies of the elementary school and of their respective values as educational instruments. Dr. Harris performs this task with skill and great learning, although assent to all of his propositions is impossible. Six years is ample time for the strictly elementary course, and to insist upon eight years is simply to yield to the influence of a bad but prevailing custom. Written English is more useful and more important than the report admits, and the arguments adduced for postponing the use of the simpler algebraic processes and the study of plane geometry—the *Raumlehre* of the German schools—are in flat contradiction to the actual experience of many of the best teachers. As the discussion of this part of the report proceeds, many other shortcomings and defects, due largely to its point of view, will appear.

The final portion of the report, written by President Andrew S. Draper, may be unreservedly commended. During his six years of service as a State superintendent in New York and two years as city superintendent in Cleveland, Mr. Draper had ample opportunity to perceive the defects of the ordinary school administration in cities. On all questions of principle his views are in full accord with those of the framers of the bill designed to place the school systems of New York and Brooklyn on a proper footing. The report lays down two fundamental principles, which will at once be agreed to. The first is, that there must be complete separation of legislative and executive functions; the second is, that the business administration of the schools must be kept distinct from the educational administration. Full authority and responsibility must be conferred upon the head of each of these departments. The detailed plan that the committee recommends is substantially that adopted in Cleveland, O., in 1892, and now known generally as the "Cleveland plan." Its essential features are a small, unpaid school board, appointed by the mayor without regard to political belief or local political divisions; a commissioner of education, who is at the head of the business department, and who appoints the superintendent; and a superintendent of schools, appointed to serve during good behavior or for a long term, under whose

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

direct control the educational administration of the schools is put. There is fair ground for a difference of opinion as to that feature of the plan which provides for the appointment of the superintendent of schools by the commissioner of education, and the dissentients from the report—Superintendents Seaver of Boston and Lane of Chicago—will find much support for their position. Notwithstanding this fact, President Draper's discussion of city school systems is clear and exhaustive, and it would be a capital document to put into the hands of mayors, superintendents of schools, members of school boards, and members of the Legislature generally.

The entire report is a scholarly and stimulating treatment of its subjects. Its authors are men of large practical experience in dealing with the problems that it discusses. It may properly take its place by the side of the report of the Committee of Ten; and the two papers together may well increase our respect for the men who are directing the development of education in the United States.

FRENEAU'S *NATIONAL GAZETTE*.

BROOKLYN, February 15, 1895.

ON Monday, October 31, 1791, the first number of the above-named paper was issued in Philadelphia. Even in its earliest issues it began a criticism of certain acts of the executive of the United States, which became more and more bitter and sweeping as time went on. This partisanship merited special notice from the rather striking circumstance that Philip Freneau, the editor of the *Gazette*, was an office-holder under the very Government he was so persistently attacking, having been appointed translating clerk in the Department of State but a few weeks before the commencement of his paper. When to this fact was added the quickly developed circumstance that the paper attacked only the Treasury and War Departments, with some few acts of the President, and had nothing but praise for the department presided over by Jefferson, the inference was clear that the Secretary of State, by his appointment, had, in modern vernacular, "muzzled" this particular paper—if, indeed, he had not deliberately subsidized an editor to attack his fellow-secretaries and the President under whom he served.

This latter view was taken by Hamilton, and as Freneau's attacks rose in crescendo, Hamilton's irritation finally led him, under a pseudonym, to print the following query (*U. S. Gazette*, July 25, 1792):

"The Editor of the *National Gazette* receives a salary from Government:

"Quere—Whether this salary is paid him for *translations;* or for *publications*, the design of which is to vilify those to whom the voice of the people has committed the administration of our public affairs—to oppose the measures of Government, and, by false insinuations, to disturb the public peace?

"In common life it is thought ungrateful for a man to bite the hand that puts bread in his mouth; but if the man is hired to do it, the case is altered. T. L."

Nor was it only Hamilton, and the host of scribblers the above note produced, who took this view of it. Jefferson himself records (Writings, i., 231) of Washington, that—

"He adverted to a piece in Freneau's paper of yesterday, he said he despised all their attacks on him personally, but that there never had been an act of the government, not meaning in the Executive line only, but in any line, which that paper had not abused. . . . He was evidently sore & warm, and I took his intention to be that I should interpose in some way with Freneau; perhaps withdraw his appointment of translating clerk in my office. But I will not do it."

This incident has been the subject of much discussion in the biographies of Jefferson and Hamilton, varying views being taken by their respective partisans. Whether a journalist is not as morally disqualified from salaried public office as a lawyer is from the jury panel, will probably ever be a question of elasticity of conscience rather than of accepted convention. But in this particular case the chief importance turns on the doubt whether Freneau was subsidized with an office to encourage him to start the *Gazette* in order that he might attack what Jefferson disapproved in the course of the Government, or was merely given the office without regard to his opinions or paper, because he could perform its duties satisfactorily. Despite Hamilton's failure at the time to obtain proof of his contention, his partisans have, from obvious inference, maintained the former view. Jefferson himself, in a letter to Washington (September 9, 1792), claimed that the appointment was solely one of merit, and not with expectation that it would lead "to any criticism on the proceedings of Government." This was supported by an affidavit of Freneau, made in consequence of the above anonymous note of Hamilton, and printed at the time (*U. S. Gazette*, August 8, 1792):

"Personally appeared before me, Matthew Clarkson, Mayor of the City of Philadelphia, Philip Freneau, of the City of Philadelphia, who, being duly sworn, doth depose and say, That no negociation was ever opened with him by Thomas Jefferson, Secretary of State, for the establishment or institution of the *National Gazette:* that the deponent's coming to the City of Philadelphia, as publisher of a Newspaper, was at no time urged, advised, or influenced by the above officer, but that it was his own voluntary act; and that the said Gazette, nor the Editor thereof, was ever directed, controuled, or attempted to be influenced, in any manner, either by the Secretary of State, or any of his friends; nor was a line ever, directly or indirectly, written, dictated, or composed for it by that officer, but that the Editor has consulted his own judgment alone in the conducting of it—free—unfettered—and uninfluenced.

"PHILIP FRENEAU.

"Sworn the 6th August, 1792, before
"MATTHEW CLARKSON, Mayor."

This double testimony was so strong as to furnish a satisfactory denial to Hamilton's charge. Yet the situation was so delicate a one at best that both sets of biographers have carefully dodged discussing the ethics involved. Perhaps had a little more attention been paid to the existing evidence, the affair might have been made clear enough to receive more definite treatment.

On February 28, 1791, or a fortnight after the appearance of "the little rift within the lute" in Washington's Cabinet, caused by the disagreement over the Bank Bill, Jefferson wrote Freneau:

"The clerkship for foreign languages in my office is vacant. The salary indeed is very low, being but two hundred & fifty dollars a year. But also it gives so little to do as not to interfere with any other calling the person may chuse, which would not absent him from the seat of government. I was told a few days ago that it might perhaps be convenient to you to accept it. If so, it is at your service. It requires no other qualification than a moderate knowledge of the French. Should anything better turn up within my department, that might suit you, I should be very happy to be able to bestow it as well. Should you conclude to accept the present, you may consider it as engaged to you, only be so good as to drop me a line informing me of your resolution."

This offer, so Jefferson stated, was made at the suggestion of Henry Lee and Madison. Freneau's reply is not extant, but can be gathered from a letter from Madison to Jefferson (May 1, 1791):

"I have seen Freneau also and given him a line to you. He sets out for Philada. today or tomorrow, though it is not improbable that he may halt in N. Jersey. He is in the habit, I find, of translating the Leyden *Gazette* and consequently must be fully equal to the task you have alloted for him. He had supposed that besides this degree of skill, it might be expected that he should be able to translate with equal propriety into French: and under this idea, his delicacy had taken an insuperable objection to the undertaking. Being now set right as to this particular and being made sensible of the advantages of Philada. over N. Jersey for his private undertaking, his mind is taking another turn; and if the scantiness of his capital should not be a bar, I think he will establish himself in the former. At all events he will give his friends there an opportunity of aiding his decision by their information & counsel. The more I learn of his character, talents and principles, the more I should regret his burying himself in the obscurity he had chosen in N. Jersey. It is certain that there is not to be found in the whole catalogue of American Printers, a single name that can approach towards a rivalship."

To this Jefferson replied (May 9, 1791):

"Your favor of the 1st came to hand on the 3d. Mr. Freneau has not followed it. I suppose therefore he has changed his mind back again, for which I am really sorry."

Even more definite as to the project was a letter Jefferson wrote to his son-in-law, Randolph, on May 15, 1791:

"I enclose you Bache's as well as Fenno's papers. You will have perceived that the latter is a paper of pure Toryism, disseminating the doctrines of Monarchy, aristocracy, & the exclusion of the people. We have been trying to get another *weekly* or *half weekly* set up, excluding advertisements, so that it might go through the states & furnish a *whig vehicle* of intelligence. We hoped at one time to have persuaded Freneau to set up here, but failed."

The scheme, however, was not abandoned with this failure, for on July 21, 1791, Jefferson wrote to Madison:

"I am sincerely sorry that Freneau has declined coming here. Tho' the printing business be sufficiently full here, yet I think he would have set out on such advantageous ground as to have been sure of success. His own genius in the first place is so superior to that of his competitors. I should have given him the perusal of all my letters of foreign intelligence & all foreign newspapers; the publication of all proclamations & other public notices within my department, & the printing of the laws, which added to his salary would have been a considerable aid. Besides this, Fenno's being the only weekly, or half weekly paper, & under general condemnation for its toryism & its incessant efforts to overturn the government, Freneau would have found that ground as good as unoccupied."

Thus urged, Freneau reconsidered his refusal, and wrote (July 25, 1791) to Madison:

"Some business detains me here a day or two longer from returning to New York. When I come, which I expect will be on Thursday, if you should not have left the City I will give you a decisive answer relative to printing my paper at the Seat of Govt. instead of in N. York. If I can get Mr. Childs to be connected with me on a tolerable plan, I believe I shall sacrifice other considerations and transfer myself to Philadelphia."

Childs agreeing to join Freneau, the next move is disclosed in the following paper:

"DEPARTMENT OF STATE OF THE UNITED STATES.

"Philip Freneau is hereby appointed Clerk for foreign languages in the office of Secretary of State, with a salary of two hundred &

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fifty dollars a year, to commence from the time he shall take the requisite oaths of qualification. Given under my hand and seal this 16th day of August, 1791. "TH. JEFFERSON."

A few weeks later the paper was started. It met with apparent success, till Genet's threat to "appeal" from Washington to the people so enraged the national spirit that it struck at "Republicanism," whether French or American. The *National Gazette* had been too conspicuous to escape from this "tidal wave"; subscriptions were withdrawn, and subscribers refused to pay, to such an extent that its notes went to protest and Freneau was compelled to abandon it, the last issue being made October 13, 1793. How close was the relation between the newspaper and the office is revealed in the following document:

"The within contains the appointment of Philip Freneau to the office of clerkship of Foreign Languages in the department of State—by Mr. Jefferson.

"I hereby resign the same appointment, from October 1st, 1793.

"PHILIP FRENEAU.

"PHILADELPHIA, October 11th, 1793."

On this Jefferson noted "rec'd. Nov. 7." Only a few weeks later he himself likewise retired from office. It was his first experiment in partisan appointments, and had resulted only in bad feeling and untruths, while certain to bring discredit to him later. But he did not learn from it, any more than his successors have done, the danger of party patronage or the folly of a "muzzled press."

PAUL LEICESTER FORD.

MEMOIRS OF THE DIRECTORY—I.

PARIS, January 31, 1895.

THE period of the French Revolution which separates the tragedies of the Terror from the epic years of the Empire is in reality less known to us than many less interesting parts of our history. The Directory loses too much in comparison with what preceded it and what followed. But the student of history who sees a development, an evolution, in the formation of society and the creation of all political institutions, ought, perhaps, to pay special attention to those years of the Directory which marked the transition between the old régime and the new one. The confusion of that period, the mediocrity of the leaders who survived the Robespierres and the Dantons, their meanness and often their infamy, their petty struggles, and, finally, their half-willing and half-forced abdication before a military Dictator who had become the armed representative of the principles of the Revolution—all these traits would form an admirable subject for an expert and profound historian; but the time is not yet come when such a history can be well written, according to the principles of the modern historical school, as many documents concerning that period have not yet come to light.

Not till a week ago have we been able to read the Memoirs of Larévellière-Lépeaux, who was one of the members of the Executive Directory of the French Republic. These memoirs are edited by his son from the autograph manuscript. The Director died on the 27th of March, 1824, having ordered that his manuscripts should not become accessible to anybody before 1873. The only persons who were allowed to take a partial survey of them after 1824 were M. de Lamartine and M. Thiers. Larévellière-Lépeaux had written his memoirs hastily and loosely, and he recommended that they should be revised and completed, with the help of some notes and papers which he left. Unfortunately, some of these notes, which were kept in a country house near Montmorency, disappeared during the first invasion of France, when the house was occupied by Hanoverian troops. Among the documents which were then burned or subtracted were the letters of Gen. Bonaparte to the Director during the campaigns of Italy. Long afterwards, the son of the Director left Paris to live in Anjou, leaving many papers in Paris in a box which was subsequently lost. It is fortunate that the manuscript of the memoirs was more carefully kept. It is not surprising that the Director wished his manuscript to be revised, but it is better that it should not have been, as the reader can easily make a sort of revision in his own mind, and it is always best to have what we call the *premier jet* of a writer. Larévellière speaks very harshly of some of the men with whom he had to associate; in some "Essential Observations on my Memoirs," he carefully advises his future editor to tone down some of his opinions and judgments.

Larévellière-Lépeaux was born on the 24th of August, 1753, at Montaigu, in Poitou. His father was of a family of "bourgeois de campagne," to use his own expression—he might have said of well-to-do peasants. If he had remembered the words of Pascal, "le moi est haïssable," he would have spared us many uninteresting details on his education and his youth. He really becomes interesting only when he becomes a public man. He was elected in Anjou a deputy to the States-General for the Tiers-État. He played no part in the great debates of the Constituent Assembly; he was afterwards appointed deputy of the Convention, and became a witness of and obscure actor in the great struggles of the Girondins and the Jacobins. He had, he says, taken the resolution "to attach himself to no party, to no chief of party, to vote always according to his conscience." He was a member of the Plain, so called in contradistinction to the Mountain. In the trial of Louis XVI. he voted for the death of the King. In a conference which he had during the trial with the members of the Gironde, Vergniaud, Pétion, and others, he made a speech which is found in the memoirs: he said that if the Convention absolved Louis XVI., the municipality of Paris, the sections, the populace, would surely murder the King and his family in the Temple, dissolve the Convention, and proclaim the Commune. "On the other hand, if you vote for condemnation—the only thing that you can do in our unhappy circumstances—your adversaries will not have the faintest pretext for suspecting your patriotism and for becoming popular at your expense; you will preserve such a moral force and such an influence that, with courage and with perseverance, you will break down the detestable projects of the anarchists."

Such arguments will recur in every great political crisis, and they are too often found convincing. The Girondins who sacrificed the King in order to keep the moral force and the popularity Larévellière-Lépeaux speaks of, lost, on the contrary, all their force and their popularity, and became the victims of Danton, who became himself the victim of Robespierre, who, in his turn, became the victim of the men of Thermidor. The Revolution, like Saturn, devoured its children; the survivors were the men of the Plain who were saved by their subserviency to the dominant party, by their silence and their obscurity. Larévellière had at times some glimpses of courage—he dared once or twice to oppose at the tribune the motions of the Jacobins; but, as he says, "a majority, however great it may be, becomes by degrees a small minority when its most important members imprudently become unpopular and allow themselves to be subjugated by a turbulent and tenacious minority." "Every day a concession is made, in the hope that the minority will be grateful to you and will abandon its unjust pretensions—nothing is more fatal than such a calculation"; such words are applicable to all times and to all assemblies.

Larévellière-Lépeaux dared to speak against the creation of the famous revolutionary tribunal. Some of his friends resigned because the decisions of the Convention were always proclaimed officially to have been unanimous, though they had opposed them. "My friends Pilastre and Leclerc resigned so as not to seem to take part in the extravagant and atrocious measures which were adopted every day. . . . As for myself, who was accustomed to speak, I did not think that I ought to resign; I wished to struggle to the end." He could not stay long, however, in the Convention; he was informed that a warrant had been issued against him, and he took flight to a sort of hermitage in the Forest of Montmorency, where Bosc had received already Roland and others. (The Memoirs of Mme. Roland were hidden for a long time in that little hermitage of Sainte-Radegonde.) Bosc and Larévellière had to live there on a little bread, potatoes, and milk. The latter travelled on foot for twelve days, in constant fear of being recognized, from Sainte-Radegonde to the house of M. de Buire, whom he had known in the States-General, near Péronne. He there learned the news of the arrest of Robespierre and of his execution, and returned to Paris. The party which was afterwards called the party of Thermidor, had at its head Tallien, Barras, Fouché, Fréron, Legendre. It was formed of the remains of the party of the Duc d'Orléans and of the party of Danton, and some of its members were secretly allied with the royalists and with the agents of the princes in exile. Cambacérès and Boissy d'Anglas had joined it.

It would be tedious to dwell on the divisions of the Assembly which was preparing the constitution that goes under the name of the Constitution of the Year iii. Larévellière was one of the members of the committee of eleven which framed this constitution. Except Daunou, Lanjuinais, and Boissy d'Anglas, all the other members are now absolutely forgotten. The executive power was confided to a committee or directory of five members, elected by two Legislative Councils—the Council of the Ancients and the Council of the Five Hundred. The Committee of Public Safety was still in existence, and Larévellière was appointed a member of it along with Daunou. But the Convention and the famous committee were no longer what they had been.

"The Convention was no longer the assembly of which the chiefs of factions, with the help of the execrable arms of the Terror, had made a unit with a terrible activity. It was now a mob without consistence, a mass without adhesion, formed of the incoherent remains of all the parties which had in succession destroyed each other. The state of the Convention was the faithful image of the state of France. The Committee of Public Safety, the real heart of the state, the only centre to which everything could have been attached, which could give movement to all, had fallen into complete dissolution."

Cambacérès was president of the committee. When he arrived at ten o'clock in the morning, his first care was to order a good *pot-au-feu*, and to have on the table excellent bread and wine—two things which could hardly be

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

found anywhere at the time but there. The other members arrived. "'President, is there anything new?' 'Why, no,' was generally the answer. The newcomers approached the *pot-au-feu*, took a bouillon, helped themselves to a slice of the beef, which they ate with good white bread and excellent Burgundy, *tarde venientibus ossa*." The chief preoccupation was the question of food and the question of paper money. The whole night was spent in printing the assignats which were necessary for the next day. Sometimes a deputation of women came asking for bread. There was a deputy, named Roux, who had the specialty of receiving them. His bureau was in the attic of the Tuileries; the way to it was a very long, narrow and steep staircase.

"When the head of the column arrived at the top, Roux went out of his office, asked them to stop and be silent, and, whether they were so or not, from this tribune he began a speech the duration of which was three, four, six hours or more, if necessary, according to the obstinacy of the petitioners. Interruptions, clamor, threats, nothing could stop this torrent of eloquence, full of all the commonplaces which everybody repeated in those times. At last, exhausted and overfed with vain words instead of bread, these unfortunate women marched off one by one, and when they were reduced to a small number, Roux took leave of them, recommending them to carry peace and hope to their families. . . . On a certain day in Germinal he perorated before a numberless multitude from eight or nine o'clock in the morning till towards five or six o'clock at night. He several times saved the Convention in this way from rather serious insurrections."

The conversations between Roux and Cambacérès are very amusing; they always ended in the preparation of a good repast for Cambacérès and the committees; the suppers often lasted till three or four o'clock in the morning. "Daunou and I," says the virtuous Larévellière, "have not to reproach ourselves with having ever taken a part in these sacrilegious repasts, either in the morning or in the evening." He is indignant at the "insane joy, the scandalous *bombance*, of the members of the committees, but is willing to admit that some relaxation was sure to follow the ferocity of the Terrorist Committee of Public Safety.

The Convention died its natural death on the 4th Brumaire Year iv, and the Constitution of the Year iii went into operation by a rearrangement of the Deputies in two chambers—the Five Hundred and the Ancients. The two councils elected the first Directory, composed of Larévellière, Rewbell, Barras, Letourneur, and Sieyès, who refused the nomination.

"On the 11th Brumaire, at ten o'clock in the morning, Rewbell, Barras, Letourneur, and myself went to the place of meeting of the Committee of Public Safety. We took there some writing-paper, an inkstand, a knife, and a few pens; then we went all four to the Petit Luxembourg [a house annexed to the Luxembourg, now inhabited by the President of the Senate], in the same carriage, surrounded, according to the terms of the Constitution, with a guard of 140 men on foot and 140 men on horseback. The dragoons who formed this escort had bad shoes, or stockings in rags instead of shoes. We found all the apartments absolutely bare—not a piece of furniture. The porter gave us a small table and four chairs which belonged to him. He made us also a present of a little wood, as the weather was very cold."

In this empty room and on this miserable table was written the act announcing to France that the Directory had entered upon its executive functions. The next day, Carnot, who had been elected in place of Sieyès, came and added his signature to the solemn document.

Correspondence.

A DOUBLE MOTIVE.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: It was a very significant vote, 165 to 120, by which the House of Representatives on Thursday defeated Mr. Cleveland's alternative of a 3 per cent. gold bond at par, though it is characteristically described as Mr. Wilson's gold-bond resolution. It is safe to say that hostility to any initiative by the President was a stronger incentive than any feeling about silver. It is amusing also to see the frantic efforts of members and of Republicans outside of Congress to divert public wrath by reviling the President for making a bad bargain—in short to

> "Compound for sins they are inclined to
> By damning those they have no mind to."

But the wind is completely taken out of their sails by the fact that, if they did not like the bargain, it was in their power, by a resolution of the simplest honesty, to convert it into a different bargain, as good as is commanded by any government in the world.

There is a charming simplicity, again, in the pretext that if these bonds were made payable in gold it would throw doubt upon the older ones, which are not; as if those bonds were not issued when there was no disparity between silver and gold, or as if the resolution could not state that, while expressed in the new bonds, it shall be regarded as implied in the old ones.

Far more important than any question of silver or of currency is that of the relation of the executive to the legislature: whether this country is to be governed by the discordant struggles of private and party intrigue in Congress, or by the steadying power of responsible executive government, subject to the approval or disapproval of Congress after full public debate, bringing out motives and character in a white light before public opinion.

Mr. Cleveland has done already magnificent service in this direction, and the whole currency complication will prove to be a blessing instead of a curse if it shall force to the front this most momentous of all issues. The next step which the President might take is to announce that the Secretary of the Treasury will appear before no more committees either of the House or the Senate. Henceforth, if the legislature wishes information from the executive branch, it can have it through an authorized agent in public session of either house, but it cannot summon the chief officers of the Government like an ordinary witness before a factional committee, and then, after cross-examination, transmute his evidence into something which it may suit the legislature to consider and vote upon without any intervention of those who are responsible for carrying on the government of the country. G. B.

Boston, February 16, 1895.

WASHINGTON AND BRADDOCK'S FIELD.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Mr. Moncure D. Conway, in his article in the *Nation* of February 14, 1895, headed "Washington's Purchase of Braddock's Field," exhibits an amazing lack of information. He evidently believes that the Great Meadows, in which Fort Necessity was situated, was the scene of Braddock's disastrous defeat, when in fact the Great Meadows is in what is now Fayette County, Pa., and Braddock's Field is in Alleghany County, Pa. I do not at this moment recollect the exact distance between them, but Braddock's army passed the Great Meadows June 25, and reached the ground where he was defeated July 9, 1755. He was defeated on the right bank of the Monongahela River, just below the mouth of Turtle Creek, not far from the present city of Pittsburgh.

Of course every one familiar with the life of Washington is aware that he owned the "Great Meadows." Isaac Craig.

Alleghany, February 16, 1895.

THE GEOFFROY SAINT HILAIRES AND BORY DE SAINT-VINCENT.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: In neither of the appreciative notices of the "Columbia University Biological Series" published in recent numbers of the *Nation* (February 7 and 14) has rectification been made of faults in names of several authors. As future editions of the excellent works in question may be demanded, I take the liberty of calling attention to them.

Extended notices are given by Prof. Osborn of the Geoffroy Saint-Hilaires, but the professor evidently believed that the elder (Étienne Geoffroy St.-Hilaire) had Geoffroy as a Christian name, and that the younger was called Isidore St.-Hilaire. The fact is, that both had as the family name Geoffroy St.-Hilaire, and both were called Geoffroy in familiar intercourse and even sometimes in formal memoirs. Both were called Geoffroy only, in passages in early works by Cuvier and other friends; and in the obituary eulogy by Quatrefages of the younger man, after the introduction, the subject is simply called M. Geoffroy or M. Isidore Geoffroy. In all bibliographies of repute the works of both men are catalogued under the name of Geoffroy St.-Hilaire. The original family name was simply Geoffroy, and Quatrefages says: "Une des branches de la famille *Geoffroy* a donné trois membres à l'Académie des Sciences dans le xviii^e^ siècle." If it is undesirable to give the full name, Geoffroy should be used and never alone St.-Hilaire, which is the name of another distinguished family.

The Baron Bory de St.-Vincent is likewise designated only under the tail end of the name (St.-Vincent) by Prof. Osborn at the page where his views are outlined (p. 205) at the head of the page, as well as in the introduction (p. 11), the retrospect (p. 249), and the index (p. 258), although in his quotation from Quatrefages's "Sketch of his Views," he is correctly named Bory. If a short form is needed, Bory is sufficient, and was used by the French author himself, but St.-Vincent should never be used alone. Bory's full name was Jean-Baptiste Georges Marie Bory de Saint-Vincent.

Theo. Gill.

Smithsonian Institution, February 15, 1895.

Notes.

D. Appleton & Co. will issue this month 'Evolution and Effort,' by Edmond Kelly, and 'The Story of the Stars,' by G. F. Chambers, first of a series of "little books dealing with various branches of knowledge."

'Birdcraft,' by Mabel Osgood Wright, to be published by Macmillan, will be distinguished from similar works by plates of birds in their

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

natural colors. The same firm has in preparation 'Æsthetic Principles,' by Henry Rutgers Marshall, and a volume of selections from Thoreau's Writings, by Henry S. Salt, his biographer.

West India sketches, under the title 'Gossip of the Caribbees,' will shortly be brought out by T. Fisher Unwin, London.

The proceedings at the Bryant centennial celebration in Cummington, Mass., last August, have been printed in an unpretentious volume of eighty pages, with a hitherto unpublished portrait of the poet for a frontispiece, and several local views. The book may be had of the Bryant Memorial Committee, Cummington, for $1 and $1.50, checks being made payable to Lorenzo H. Tower.

We need scarcely recur to the contents of the bound volumes of *Harper's Monthly* for 1894 (vols. 88, 89). *Harper's Weekly* for the same period (vol. 38) possesses its customary value as a pictorial mirror of the time. The Brazilian war, the war over Korea, the civil war known as the Chicago strike, the war against Tammany, the Tillman dispensary war in South Carolina, the campaign of Coxey's Army of the Commonweal, the Bluefields tempest in a teapot—these are some of the salient features of a disturbed year liberally illustrated with scenes and portraits. The illustrious dead are duly commemorated, and number Kossuth, Carnot, and Alexander III., Rubinstein, Helmholtz, Froude, and Holmes. The series of Congressional crayon portraits is continued, not often as unsuccessfully as in the case of Senator Lodge. But most worthy to be mentioned are the portraits of the leaders of the mushroom A. P. A., and of the chief English, French, and German Socialists. These will repay study. Decidedly the most interesting thing in this line in *Harper's Bazar* for 1894 (vol. 27) is the set of four portraits of two of the three female Assemblymen of Colorado, and the female State Superintendents of Public Instruction in that State and in Wyoming. These ladies are all very respectfully treated in biographical sketches which do not suggest the *Bazar's* opposition to woman suffrage. Otherwise, except for a portrait group of Mrs. Cleveland and the wives of Cabinet officers, politics is inconspicuous in the columns of the *Bazar*. Two serial stories, 'Highland Cousins,' by William Black, and Walter Besant's 'Beyond the Dreams of Avarice,' run through the volume, and here also ends the late Theodore Child's discourse on coiffures, 'Wimples and Crisping-pins,' since become a book. The book-notices are all but exclusively of novels or housekeeping works, and the exceptions are made by no apparent rule. The negro has pretty nearly disappeared from the humorous page of the *Bazar*, where he reigned supreme for many years.

"Made to sell" must be the verdict on 'Great Men and Famous Women: A Series of Pen and Pencil Sketches,' edited by Chas. F. Horne (New York: Selmar Hess). The first two volumes, of soldiers and sailors, are a hodge-podge which brings between two covers Frederick the Great, Bonaparte, Francis Marion, and Tecumseh. The sketches are partly borrowed from well-known English or Continental sources, partly written to order on this side of the water, where "Oliver Optic" seems a natural selection for the biographer of Grant, and Mrs. Amelia E. Barr of Sam Houston, who, she says, "on the roll of Fame, shines forth the noblest, the most princely, the most picturesque and chivalrous character in American history." The medley of illustrations is on a par with the letterpress. There are to be six more volumes like these.

The 41st volume of the 'Dictionary of National Biography' (Macmillan) ends with O'Dugan. The tract of names embraced is noticeably barren of literary distinction. In politics we meet with Lord North, Daniel O'Connell, who occupies 28 pages, Smith O'Brien, Feargus O'Connor, and Sir Stafford Northcote, who, we are told, "as a financier, deserves high credit . . . for his acknowledgment of the fact that the income-tax had ceased to be a temporary impost"—an acknowledgment which our own political financiers of another generation may have to make, more or less cheerfully. American interest in this volume attaches not only to Lord North, but also to Nowell and Oakes, early New England worthies, and to the naturalist Nuttall. So recent a celebrity as the late Miss Marianne North has been caught by the editor in passing.

'On the Art of Writing Fiction' is the alluring title of a series of papers recently reprinted from a British magazine (London: Wells, Gardner, Darton & Co.; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons). It is in a way a supplement to Mr. James Payn's suggestion, ten years ago, that novel-writing was a trade anybody could learn—a suggestion which was perhaps the "exciting cause" of Mr. Walter Besant's very practical lecture on the "Art of Fiction." There are eleven papers in the present volume, all by British story-tellers more or less known; and the advice they give is obviously intended for the British novice. The author of 'Mlle. Ixe,' for example, discusses the short story from the point of view of the British magazine, and without a single reference to Daudet or Maupassant, Miss Wilkins or Miss Jewett, and without any real understanding of the essential quality of the short story as distinguished on the one hand from the novel, and on the other from the character-sketch. Equally empty are the papers by Mrs. Parr and Mrs. Macquoid. Perhaps the one paper from which a beginner might benefit is the carelessly written chapter on "The Novel of Manners," by Mrs. Walford.

'The Making of the Body,' by Mrs. S. A. Barnett (Longmans), is an Anatomy and Physiology designed for children. The labored rendering of technicalities, and the very inconsequential stories introduced as explanations, would appear likely to bewilder instead of enlighten an ordinary child. If it is necessary to discuss the brain-membranes in such a book, why substitute for the common names such barbarisms as "The Hard Mother Covering," "The Spider-Web Covering," "The Pious Mother Covering"? Or, to illustrate the action of the nervous system, why introduce such rubbish as "The other day a young American girl said that when she first came to England she put her hands on the bars of the fire [*sic*], not knowing that they were hot enough to burn her, for in America they only use closed stoves"? Dr. Ernest Hart, who ought to know, in an introductory note speaks of this text-book as "delightful" and as "a fairy-tale which is true"; that it is "imaginative in diction [as it most surely is] and accurate in fact." If English school-children have the scientific use of the imagination cultivated in this fashion as a rule, we can well appreciate the astonishing grasp of the ridiculous that the adult mind sometimes displays.

We have received from George Parker Winship, Assistant in American History in Harvard College, a "List of Titles of Documents relating to America contained in Volumes i.-cx. of the *Colección de Documentos Inéditos para la Historia de España*," reprinted from the Bulletin of the Public Library of the City of Boston for October, 1894. Of the value of this little publication, or of the labor involved in its preparation, it is unnecessary to speak. Students of Spanish-American history, however, understand and appreciate it, and they will not be slow in acknowledging their obligations to Mr. Winship for simplifying a task in which the search for facts has, hitherto, been not unlike the proverbial "hunt for a needle in a haystack." That "a similar list of all the documents in this" and, we may add, in all "other Spanish collections is much to be desired" is true; and we doubt if American investigators will rest content until their wishes in this respect are gratified. In the meantime we can only hope that some one as well qualified as Mr. Winship, and with the requisite amount of time and enthusiasm, may be found to undertake the work.

Excepting the genus *Thomomys*, "North American Fauna, No. 8," by Dr. C. Hart Merriam, published by the United States Department of Agriculture, is a monographic revision of those destructive little rodents the "Pocket-Gophers" or "Pouched Rats," the *Geomyidæ*. The work is especially valuable to students of the mammalia. It forms a volume of two hundred and twenty pages, with nineteen plates, and numerous figures in the text, of skeletal details, and three plates of maps showing the distribution. Eight genera are recognized, seven of them being new; thirty-one species, sixteen being new; and five new sub-species. The map locates *Geomys* in southern Georgia and Alabama, in Florida, and in the States west of the Mississippi to the mountains, where it gives way to *Thomomys*, which extends to the Pacific, into British America, and into Mexico. The new genera are Mexican and Central American; one of them, *Cratogeomys*, ranges through New Mexico and Texas to Colorado.

Prof. Ludwig Schlesinger's 'Handbuch der Theorie der Linearen Differentialgleichungen' (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner) is a compilation based entirely upon the works of Fuchs and of the Fuchsians, Thomé, Poincaré, Frobenius, etc. Though without pretensions to originality, it is a work with which a mathematician cannot dispense. Herr Paul Günther, how related to Dr. Siegmund Günther we know not, is said to have collaborated upon certain chapters, especially, as might have been guessed, upon those that are historical. The second volume has yet to appear.

The twenty-eighth edition of the newspaper catalogue published by Rudolf Mosse's advertising agency in Hamburg, has recently appeared in an enlarged form. The different publications are arranged in classes according to subjects; in many cases the circulation is given, together with photographic reproductions in reduced form of a number of papers. The hints to advertisers are of special interest to American readers as showing the European practice in such matters.

That excellent British quarterly, the *Illustrated Archæologist*, has been amalgamated with a kindred publication, and begins the current year under the new designation of the *Reliquary and Illustrated Archæologist*, under the editorship of J. Romilly Allen, F.S.A. Scot. (London: Bemrose & Sons, 23 Old Bailey, E. C.). In the January number nothing is more interesting than the views of human and animal remains and personal belongings of the dead found in some Hunnish graves recently discovered at Cziko, near Buda-Pesth. Among the articles were styles like those used by the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Romans for their wax tablets—one in silver in a woman's hand.

In the *Tribuna* of Rome for January 28 we find a somewhat incoherent report of Dr. B. Amante's search for the tomb of Vittoria Colonna. Her remains have been positively identified in the same sepulchre with her husband's in a church at Naples.

The *Annales de Géographie* for January contains an interesting account of the earthquake at Constantinople, July 10, 1894, by D. Eginitis of Athens. In many places of the epicentre, or centre of disturbance, it was noticed that the swallows some minutes before the shock deserted their nests and flew, some high into the air, where they remained till the shocks had ceased; others took refuge in great numbers on the telegraph-wires. A submarine cable was cut, as by a knife, in many places, "probably from the fall of rocks." From the records of the different European seismometers, it appears that the earthquake-wave travelled at the average rate of a little over three kilometres a second. The direction of the epicentral axis makes it probable that it was not due to volcanic action, but that it was a phenomenon "de nature *tectonique*." Saint-Sophia fortunately escaped with only a few slight injuries to the decorations of the cupolas. The ancient Byzantine fortifications also remain nearly intact. M. A. L. d'Albéca discusses the future of Dahomey, which he paints in bright colors. He believes that all the trade of the Hinterland, as far as the Niger, will eventually fall into the hands of the French, now that the war has been brought to a close. The commerce at the French ports has more than doubled since 1890, and now amounts to nearly five million dollars annually. This is almost wholly the product of the oil-palm. Each tree is the property of an individual, the land being owned by the community, and even in the jungles every one knows his own tree and respects the property of the others. The income from a single tree is a little over two dollars a year.

The *Geographical Journal* for February opens with the description of the physical features of Kolgueff Island, in the Arctic Ocean, by Mr. A. Trevor-Battye, in the course of which he casually says that "on one occasion we caught at one haul of the net 3,300 brent-geese." J. v. Payer, in an animated account of the beauties of arctic scenery, tells of his projected artistic expedition to the east coast of Greenland. He proposes to start in June, 1896, and to take with him two landscape-painters, one animal-painter, and a photographer. Dr. D. Kerr-Cross describes an excursion into the mountainous region to the north of Lake Nyasa, inhabited by a tribe with finer villages and better-built houses than are to be found in any part of uncivilized Africa. The people are industrious, cultivating the ground so carefully with giant hoes that the "fields look as if they had been deeply ploughed, and every furrow is perfectly straight." Slavery is unknown among them, and "woman is accorded a very high place." Pure science is represented in the paper by Prof. W. M. Davis of Harvard University on the "Development of Certain English Rivers." The progress of the Siberian railway is described by P. Kropotkin, and there is a very interesting letter from Mrs. Bishop giving the latest incidents of her adventurous journey in the far East. In the course of it she says: "Korea is the most uninteresting country I have travelled in. The people seem the dregs of a race." During her river voyage to Mukden she encountered a five days' storm of incessant rain, which "turned the magnificent plain of Mantchuria into a malarious inland sea" eight feet deep. "I saw the destruction of over thirty prosperous villages, and had the happiness of saving some lives." In a postscript written from a Russian frontier military post, she refers to the assertion of some English papers that "Russia has massed 5,000 men on the Tumen River," and adds: "I have been along the whole Tumen frontier, and there are just *fifteen* men, the garrison at the mud hovel from which I now write."

The Chinese and Indian tea trade was the subject of an interesting paper recently read before the Society of Arts by Mr. A. G. Stanton. In it he showed that the bad work, the slovenly manufacture, and the dishonest make-shifts which gave the name of "lie tea" to portions of the staple export of China, are merely the industrial counterparts of the political corruption brought to light by the present war with Japan. From having practically the monopoly of the British market thirty years ago, China now supplies only 12 per cent. of the tea imported into Great Britain. In seventeen years the imports of Indian tea have risen from 27,000,000 to 178,000,000 pounds, mainly because of the care in manufacture and honesty in dealing of the Indian tea-grower.

In a lecture on the Nile, before the Royal Institution, Sir Colin Scott-Moncrieff, the head of the Irrigation Department in Egypt, strongly emphasized the fact that the possession of the Upper Nile was absolutely essential to the existence of that country. If Italy, for instance, occupied Khartum, her natural and proper course would be "to spread the waters of the Low Nile over the Sudan; and no nation in Europe understood irrigation so well as the Italians. What then would become of Egypt's cotton crops?" Or regulating sluices could be built across the outlet of the Victoria Nyanza, and Egypt could be flooded or its water-supply cut off at pleasure. He held it to be evident, therefore, that the river from this lake to the Mediterranean should be under one rule. This is significant in the light of Italy's recent operations against the Mahdists and her occupation of Kassala.

According to the census of 1891, the results of which have now been published, the population of Norway at that time consisted of 2,005,880 persons, of whom 968,255 were men and 1,037,625 women.

—Mr. James Rodway's 'In the Guiana Forest' (Scribners) conveys vividly the impressions made by the great forests of tropical South America upon a man who has acute artistic perceptions of nature and a poetical way of describing what he has seen. He justly dwells, again and again, on the struggle for existence, in plants and animals, ever going on in those deep forests. He describes the native inhabitant "with rare pictorial skill," as Mr. Grant Allen observes in the introduction to the volume; and the reader, after wandering through the trackless wastes of Guiana with the author, but without maps, dates, or even compass, at last emerges with relief, and is more than ever content with his own home in a civilized land. The book must be regarded as a poem rather than as a sober contribution to natural history; for while it is full of statements in regard to plants and animals, everything is told from a poet's standpoint, and in the whole book there is scarcely a fact stated in the exact way of the great naturalist whose doctrines are here made the foundation of a long and almost monotonous dream rather than essay. The truth is, that the struggle for life, the war between animal and animal, plant and plant, or animal and plant, not less than the occasional correlation between them, can be recognized in temperate or even in sub-arctic and arctic climates, not less truly than in a steaming tropical forest. The species are fewer, there is far less of life, but the evidences of the struggle and of the survival of the fittest are not less clear. The book contains a fair number of illustrations, apparently from photographs, one of them unfortunately named "In a mango swamp," when the word "mangrove" was evidently meant. The great defect is the want of exactness above hinted at. We are not told when the author's wanderings took place, we are not favored with any map or chart of his travels; and while he has a chapter about the rivers and creeks of Guiana, not a single river is called by name.

—Few recent volumes on Dante are so rich in interest as the new and complete edition of all Dante's writings, 'Tutte le Opere di Dante Alighieri, nuovamente rivedute nel testo,' that Dr. Edward Moore, the best-known English student of Dante, has prepared for the Oxford University Press (New York: Macmillan). This interest is due not only to the fact that, strange to say, all Dante's works have been for the first time printed in a single volume, whose clear type, convenient form, and scrupulous accuracy will doubtless make it a standard edition, but to the interesting and important new readings which Dr. Moore has introduced into the text. In a writer such as Dante, who seems to have weighed, in much of his work, the effect of almost every word, even slight textual changes become exceedingly suggestive. To comment on them in detail in these columns, however, would be to burden the general reader with confusing details. Let it suffice here briefly to describe the character of Dr. Moore's work. In the 'Vita Nuova' and the 'De Monarchia' he has followed almost exactly Witte's texts; in the 'Epistolæ,' the text of Fraticelli, corrected by the facsimile of the Grenoble MS.; in the 'Commedia,' Witte's text, with such alterations as would be expected from Dr. Moore's recent work on the textual criticism of the same poem. The greatest changes are in the 'Convito,' which is for the first time carefully and intelligently edited by an expert on the basis of two good manuscripts and the published texts. The text of the 'Canzoniere' is revised by Mr. York Powell, and the poems to some extent rearranged. Mr. Toynbee has added an excellent index of the proper names and important subjects mentioned or treated in all the works. The rule has been to include in this volume all that has been generally attributed to Dante, though we notice the omission of the spurious letter to Guido da Polenta, of the three others not generally printed, and of certain verses frequently, and with some show of reason, ascribed to him. It would have been a great advantage to have the principle rigidly carried out, and to possess in a single volume every line attributed to Dante to which the student of Dante might have occasion to refer; but the public should be, and doubtless will be, grateful for this exceedingly convenient edition, which we owe to Dr. Moore's scholarship and acumen.

—'Heine in Frankreich' is the title of a ponderous doctor dissertation of more than 450 pages, with which a young Swiss-American, Louis P. Betz, a pupil of Prof. Morf of Zürich, makes his scholarly début (Zürich:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Albert Müller). Although there is a good deal of rather shallow rhetoric and irrelevant information in this book, it is, for more reasons than one, a work of most decided merit. It not only gives a detailed account of Heine's relation to his French surroundings and contemporaries but it also places before us in chronological order and with great bibliographical fulness the French opinion of Heine, from Saint-René Taillandier to Jules Lemaître; it narrates, again chronologically, the numerous attempts at French translations from Heine during the last sixty years; and, lastly, it traces the influence of Heine on French poetry and thought from the Romanticists and Parnassiens down to the most modern symbolism. Compared with the heated discussions as to Heine's poetic merits which have been raging in Germany ever since Menzel's violent attacks on him, the nearly unanimous appreciation of his genius on the part of the French critics, as brought out in this book, is truly remarkable. All the more so since Heine himself confessed that he always felt a stranger in France: "Mein Geist fühlt sich in Frankreich exiliert, in eine fremde Sprache verbannt." The last part of this remark, *i. e.*, Heine's inability to enter fully into the spirit of the French language, is fully confirmed in an interesting chapter of Dr. Betz's book, in which it is proved beyond doubt that Heine never acted without assistance as his own translator. How slovenly and ungrammatically he would sometimes write, is demonstrated by several of his letters published in this connection. In one of them, addressed to Balzac, we have the sentence: "Accusez-moi *avec* deux mots la reception de ces lignes a*ff*in que," etc.

—The meagreness of the English records relating to Joan of Arc, considering the prominence of her exploits in the long conflict between England and France, has often been remarked. Of the documents dealing with her life and adventures which have thus far been discovered in England, none actually gives her name. An extract from a long petition from the Duke of Bedford to the King, in which Joan of Arc is described as "a disciple and lyme of the Feende, called the Pucelle, that used fals enchauntements and sorcerie," is given by Rymer. The Abbé Henri Debout, having failed to find the manuscript referred to by Rymer—"A. D. 1428, An 7 H. 6, Cott. Bib: Titus E. 5"—and being unable to account for its disappearance upon any reasonable hypothesis, concluded that no such manuscript had ever existed, and that the reference given by Rymer was spurious. An account of his search and of his conclusion has just been published at Paris in a brochure entitled 'Jeanne d'Arc et les Archives Anglaises.' Such an attack upon the English historiographer was not likely to pass unnoticed; and in the London *Athenæum* for January 12 Mr. J. M. Stone gives an account of his successful effort to verify the reference. The occurrence of the same reference in the appendix to the fifth volume of the 'Rotuli Parliamentorum,' from the eighteenth year of Henry VI. to the close of the reign, seemed to confirm Rymer's accuracy; and a careful search of the volume Titus E. 5 was rewarded by finding the above-quoted extract from the petition of the Duke of Bedford on folio 372. So that, to quote Mr. Stone, "the fragment in question is where Rymer, Topham, and Astle said it was, and M. Debout is not only mistaken in declaring the absence of any such document, but his theories founded upon its non-existence, and set forth in his pamphlet, are without the slightest foundation."

—Augustus Strindberg, the Swedish writer, who is equally well known as misogynist and as playwright, has lately been visited by a representative of the *Temps* at the hospital of St. Louis in Paris, where he has been confined in consequence of some indiscreet chemical experiments. Strindberg's mind, according to his own account of it, is many-sided, and it is a little hard to make out where his chief interests lie. He studied medicine at first, but took to the theatre in 1870. His second play, "Master Olaf," was refused, and he went into other work, entering the Royal Library at Stockholm, and devoting himself to scientific and historical labors. He wrote a history of Sweden in two volumes, and in 1879 he presented to the Academy of Inscriptions in Paris a memoir on the relations between Sweden and China. In 1880 his "Master Olaf" was played with success, and this brought him back to the theatre again, and led him to write the twenty or more plays which have made his reputation. In 1883 he went to Paris, where he collaborated with Leconte de Lisle, Coppée, Hérédia, and others in the *Monde Poétique*, a Parnassian review. Since then, he says, he has made some slight contributions to science, such as a new process of celestial photography, the extraction of carbon from sulphur, and the demonstration of a nervous system in plants. Last year he published, in German, "the first fascicule of a great work, the 'Antibarbarus,' which will be a complete revision of the physical and natural sciences." His latest triumph, so far as we have noted, is in a "vivisection" in the *Revue Blanche* for January, entitled "De l'infériorité de la femme." In it he gathers together in a pleasing mass everything that he can find to his purpose out of all the men of science from Aristotle to Lombroso, and all the philosophers from Rousseau to Nietzsche, and launches it full at what St. Augustine calls the *devotus fœmineus sexus*. That more patient and gentler sex seems not yet to have turned its attention to him, or to have remonstrated with him. When it does, he may perhaps seek safety among the explosives of his laboratory.

—The second Memoir from the Biological Laboratory of Johns Hopkins University is a monograph of the genus *Salpa* by Prof. W. K. Brooks, the result of many years' investigation of a difficult and technical subject. A summary of the author's conclusions on the origin and development of the life of the open sea, to which he devotes a chapter, is not without general interest. He first points out that practically all pelagic animals are carnivorous, and that there is nothing in the sea comparable with the great army of highly organized herbivora of the land. Plants are rare away from the shores, and consist of minute unicellular algæ and diatoms. On these the small shrimp-like copepod crustaceans feed, little creatures of which thousands may be contained in a glass of sea-water. These copepods are the real harvest of the sea, and the basis on which the subsistence of the more highly organized carnivores depends. All highly organized pelagic animals give evidence of having passed through a stage of life connected with the coasts, the land, or the sea-bottom. The largest existing animals are pelagic, but the few which are primitively pelagic are very small and simply organized. The latter fact is due to the easy conditions of pelagic life, in which there is no fierce competition, and the environment is so simple that there is little chance for diversity of habits. Survival is determined by accidental space-relations rather than by a struggle of competitors.

—The primitive pelagic fauna consisted of small animals of simple structure, but representing a number of diverse types. The appendicularia and veiled medusæ are also regarded as primitive types, and from the copepods the author would derive the whole group of crustacea. This fauna probably flourished at the surface before the bottom of the deep sea (owing to a want of oxygen and other causes) was habitable. Marine life is older than terrestrial life, and as all marine life has shaped itself in relation to the pelagic food-supply, the latter is the only independent factor, and must therefore be the oldest. For a vast period of time life consisted of an innumerable multitude of a few pelagic types living at the surface. No great advance took place until the sea-bottom became habitable. Bottom colonies started in shallow water were exposed to numerous accidents from which those at greater depths were free, and it is possible that the first deep-water fauna may have been the one to persist and the source of most modern forms. Crowded on the bottom, the colonists were brought into competition with each other; divergencies and differentiation arose. Since competition must always be sharpest between near relatives with similar habits, the connecting forms were rapidly eliminated. The olenellus fauna of the Cambrian, the oldest fauna known, may not have represented a long period of slow differentiation into types, but, from its approximation to the hypothetical colonies, may perhaps represent a rapid differentiation of forms comparatively near to the primitive fauna of the Archæan Sea.

MASTERPIECES OF GREEK SCULPTURE.—I.

Masterpieces of Greek Sculpture: A Series of Essays on the History of Art. By Adolph Furtwängler. Edited by Eugénie Sellers, with 19 full-page plates and 200 text illustrations. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1895. Pp. xxiii., 487.

No one is announced as the translator of this work, and the lady who is mentioned as editor makes it clear, in her long preface, that she has taken the book to pieces and put it together again in a fashion which would seem to make her a joint author. So numerous are the changes, announced and implied, that the editor finds it necessary to state that in certain cases she has preserved the original text. "Here," the editor says, speaking of the chapters on the Venus of Milo, the Apollo of the Belvedere, and the Acropolis Temples, "the only alterations are those that have been introduced by the author himself." Mention of the theories of those who have disputed the Pheidian origin of the Parthenon sculptures has been "relegated to foot-notes." Reference is made "throughout to the English edition of Prof. Helbig's 'Museums of Classical Art in Rome,'" a book which we are told is to appear almost simultaneously with the present one. Compression has been freely used, and the editor confesses to having "left rather more to the imagination of the reader than is usual in a German work of this nature." Forty-five illustrations are given which were not in the German edition, and the editor states that she has tried, in arranging them, "to con-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vince the reader of what great results might be achieved with the help of a collection of casts comprising . . . all or nearly all the extant products of classical art, whatever their period, and supplemented by a complete series of photographs." Photographs have been used in place of some inferior illustrations of the German edition, and these new pictures the editor introduces with special mention.

It is true that Prof. Furtwängler is stated to have sanctioned all the editorial alterations; but it still remains apparent that this is a work by Prof. Furtwängler and Miss Eugénie Sellers, and that the competency of the editor as well as of the well-known Berlin professor is involved. The author's preface stands, however, dated Berlin, 1893, as his declaration of his intentions in his important essay. He announces, speaking of his inquiries into sculpture, that "the material treated in this book consists for the most part of antique copies," and he explains that this is because most of the important works of antiquity can be known to us by copies only. He claims for the Roman copies of early Greek and Hellenistic sculpture a special value as distinguished from the originals found in Greece and in the islands of late years. The copies, he thinks, have preserved for us "that pick of the masterpieces of the classical epoch which pleased ancient taste and connoisseurship in the times of highest culture." The assumption is, of course, that the greater number of original Greek works recently discovered are not such masterpieces—in which assumption the author is on safe ground; but he thinks, moreover, that it is possible to discriminate in the copies between what is derived from the original and what is added by the copyist. It is pointed out that a close comparison of the different existing ancient copies, not hitherto feasible, can now be carried on by means of photographs. He admits, however, the "rich mine of error" which is to be found in inquiries of this kind.

It will be thought by many that another "rich mine of error" is to be found in the attribution of existing works to celebrated ancient artists. The author seems to be aware that he has been bold in this matter of attribution. Assuredly an extremely cautious, almost an agnostic, position befits the investigator in these matters. Thus, as all we know of the characteristics of Skopas's work in sculpture is by inference, by putting this and that together and drawing the conclusion that Skopas must have been an artist with such and such characteristics, it is rash to ascribe individual works to the school of Skopas merely because they are found to possess the same characteristics. To do so is to make a conventional Skopas; it is to create a sculptor of a certain peculiar order of merit and to call the sculptor "Skopas," and the works in question the work of the "Skopasian School." There is no doubt that the German plan of starting theories, right or wrong, and of considering him a poor and unprofitable scholar who has no new theories to offer, has been the cause of a great advance in scholarship. It is not the less certain that, given any particular theory, one should be slow to accept it even if an excellent German name is signed to it. Each student must form his own opinions as to the relative rashness or conservatism of each separate archæologist.

An examination of the text shows much of that "boldness of attribution" which the author thinks we shall find in his work, but also a willingness to go with previous writers in their conclusions, though their names may not be mentioned. An instance of such an acceptance of received attributions is the assumption (p. 295) that the group in Munich, No. 96 of Brunn's catalogue, is a close copy of the Eirene and Ploutos of Kephisodotos. This is also an instance of the general tendency in archæology to reason too closely from slight evidence; to set up a probability, and then to argue from it as from a fact. The Munich group may well indeed be a copy of the original work described by Pausanias, but to assume that it is such a copy, and a close and accurate one; to find in the treatment of the drapery an intentional resemblance to the drapery of Pheidias sixty years before; to infer from this that the sculptor had the deliberate purpose to embody in his statue the national hopes of the Athenians of a revival of a maritime supremacy like that of the days of Perikles and Pheidias, is to argue in a circle. Such theories are admirably suggestive if treated as theories and suggestions, and it is as a suggestion only that this very theory is stated in Brunn's invaluable catalogue and in Friedrichs-Wolters' 'Die Gipsabgüsse Antiker Bildwerke'; but the tone of the text before us is not suggestive nor theoretical.

In the chapter devoted to Pheidias (p. 6) occurs a curious instance of the way in which this sort of argument is conducted. The two statues of Athena from the Chigi collection now in the Dresden Museum, Nos. 69 and 72 of Hettner's catalogue, being under discussion, there is question as to what was held in the right hand, which, with the arm, is missing in either statue. A cast of a gem is cited, the original gem being unknown to the author and editor, and the author's note states that, from the cast or impression, he had thought it modern, but now thinks it of the time of Augustus. This cast, of which a cut is given, shows a head, very fairly like the heads of the two statues under consideration, with "the short, knotted-up hair, leaving the ear free, the fillet, the neck, the opening of the drapery on the breast, even the folds falling over the left breast, the transverse ægis, and the raised left upper arm." Certainly there is good reason for the supposition that the gem was copied from a statue of the same type as the two Dresden statues. In the field of the gem, near and a little above the right shoulder, is a small crested helmet, and with this helmet the text before us deals in the following words (p. 6): "In the field in front of the left shoulder is a helmet. Such objects on gems are never mere 'symbols' as they are on coins; therefore I think it quite certain that the artist, who had not room in the picture for the right arm, wished at least to indicate that the goddess bore a helmet in her right hand. This trait completes our conception of the original statue." That is all. Observe the reasoning: the cast is from a gem, probably of Roman time though long thought modern; it gives a head very like the heads of these two statues; there is a helmet in the gem near the right shoulder; therefore the original statue (*i. e.*, the lost bronze which it is hoped to restore in thought by consideration of its supposed copies) had a helmet in the right hand.* Good theorizing, excellent and fruitful suggestion; but how about the phrase "quite certain," and the statement in the succeeding paragraph about "the composition which we have thus won back"?

*A. S. Murray, in his 'History of Greek Sculpture' (1893), suggests that the helmet was in the hand, his reason being that ancient writers dwell on the beauty of the face, which would otherwise have been hidden. He gives a terracotta statuette holding the helmet in the right hand, with the forearm extended.

The rest of the argument, which goes to show that the lost original was the Lemnian Athena by Pheidias, described by Pliny and Lucian, is similar in character to the arguments previously cited. It is full of suggestions which show a wide knowledge of extant sculptures and a great quickness of eye and of memory in bringing things together; but each step in the argument is long, and there is indefinite possibility of other suggestions arising which will make those steps hereafter impossible. It seems odd, by the way, that these statues in Dresden should be spoken of as life-size when the catalogue itself gives them as seven feet high. Let the statues in question be called hereafter the Lemnian Athena—that will do very well as a name of convention, like the name Panathenaic given to the frieze of the Parthenon; but as for a reasonable certainty of the names being correct, that is another matter. It should always be kept in mind that not one existing piece of sculpture is known to be by Pheidias. All attempts to judge by internal evidence that a given work of art is a copy of one of his must proceed in a tentative way, as thus: The sculptures of the Parthenon must be by him, at least in part, because he was the best sculptor of his time, and these are the best works of the time; because, moreover, Plutarch states (we quote the Dryden-Clough translation) that "Pheidias had direction of all the works and was surveyor-general"; but as the sculptures of the Parthenon are by him, so other works in which the drapery is cast in a similar way, and so on, must also be by him. We say again it is a matter of convention: it is a Pheidias of convention who executed the Parthenon sculptures, and whose style we learn to judge from them, and this conventional Pheidias was very probably the author of the lost original statue from which the Dresden statues are copied. Of the real Pheidias less is known. It is altogether well that some ascriptions should be accepted as working hypotheses, but only on condition that their lack of confirmation by direct testimony should be admitted continually. In this direction it is really a pleasure to meet with a statement like that on page 307: "Our knowledge of the art of Praxiteles rests primarily on the extant original statue, the Hermes of Olympia."

All this extreme readiness to fix names and dates, and to decide upon as fact that which is only approximate probability, is harmless when addressed to archæologists. They will be ready to distinguish the settled and certain from the probable and plausible, and they will be only too ready, with this as with the parent work, the 'Meisterwerke der Griechischen Plastik,' to object to all, even the most probable theories, and to set up others over against them. Treating this book, then, as a book for the archæologists, it is of really extraordinary value. The readiness of suggestion, the immense knowledge of the extant works of art from which to draw suggestions, the swift dexterity with which one work of art is used to interpret another, make this a really epoch-making work. If the German original were under consideration, little else than these merits would need to be spoken of; but the offering of an English version very fully illustrated is, almost of necessity, the offering of a book for the artist and the general student of fine-art.

In this capacity, as a work for general reading, the illustrations are of supreme value. The less known and less accessible sculptures are those chosen for photographing, such as statues and busts in private collections; those newly discovered; those if not newly disco-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vered, at least newly put in places easy of general access; those which have hitherto excited little attention; and finally those which may be said never to have existed before in modern times, made up as they are of pieces brought together according to new suggestions. Thus, we have among the eighteen large photogravures two views of the statues of Athena in Dresden named above, one of those statues modified by the substitution of a plaster cast of the Bologna head (Friedrichs-Wolters, 519) for its previously attached head in marble, and with these a side view of the Bologna head by itself and on a large scale. Here, too, is a photogravure of the Amazon at Lansdowne House in London; a statue in the Villa Medici at Rome, completed by placing upon it a head called the head of Meleager; a little-known female head in Lord Leconfield's collection, and a splendid bronze bust which, though in the Louvre, is assuredly not often cited. The two hundred text-illustrations, principally photographic, are equally important except in the beauty of the prints. Many of them give in different aspects the same works which are shown in the plates. Among them are also the Hermes of the Palatine Hill, now in the new museum at Diocletian's Baths in Rome, a wonderful statue in the Barracco collection at Rome, the Farnese Gladiator in the Naples Museum given without the restorations, and other statues similarly put back into their actual condition as broken, but no longer disguised, vestiges of antiquity.

Among the illlustrations which are not photographic, the more important serve to show the author's decision as to the proper original condition of a work of art. Such is the restoration of the Aphrodite of Melos (p. 380), her left hand holding an apple resting upon a square pillar, and her right hand sustaining the drapery on the left thigh. Such is the restoration, page 127, of a badly restored statue in the Vatican, the so-called Alcibiades; the changes from the statue as it now stands in the Hall of the Biga being not radical in character but extremely suggestive, and giving a Greek aspect to that which had been made into a pseudo-Roman warrior. Such is the restoration (p. 88) of a torso in the Cassel Gallery as a Hephaistos in the spirit of a head in the Vatican; the two fragments being combined into a true-seeming Greek statue.

THE DEAD TSAR.

Alexander III. of Russia. By Charles Lowe, M.A. Macmillan & Co.

THE private character and sovereign deeds of the late Emperor Alexander III. of Russia are likely to furnish material for debate during a long time to come. Mr. Lowe has acted wisely, from a business point of view at least, in getting his Life of the Emperor promptly upon the market; and, until M. Anatole Leroy-Beaulieu shall see fit to give us his opinion on the subject, this Life will, probably, exert a widespread influence. This is unfortunate for Russia and the foreign public, but will, no doubt, be profitable to Mr. Lowe. The public loves dearly an overwhelming arraignment, a crushing condemnation of things and people, especially of powerful things and people. That is, practically, what Mr. Lowe has given us—a denunciatory history from a thoroughly British standpoint.

The plan of his book is very good. In a well-digested preliminary chapter he relates the history of Alexander III.'s ancestors, beginning with Catherine II. Within that hundred-years' limit we must, in effect, seek the genesis of most of the traits embodied in the character of any modern Emperor of Russia down to the present date, though historical precedent now bids us look for a fresh departure—so far as the strong national characteristics and traditions will permit—at any moment. But, from the outset, Mr. Lowe is inclined to adopt the least favorable version of any historical incident, and to omit significant details which would cast quite a different light upon the monarch with whom he is dealing at the moment. For example: he states that Nicholas I. was made to succeed Alexander I. in 1825 because the rightful heir, the intervening brother, Constantine Pavlovitch, was such a startling copy in mind and person of his mad father Paul that he had to be passed over, and allowed to indulge his brutal and eccentric passions in the innocuous obscurity of private life. If true, that would be the reverse of discreditable to Russia, but it has always been accepted as a fact that Constantine voluntarily resigned his right to the throne in order that he might marry a fascinating Polish Countess. Again, Mr. Lowe states that Nicholas I., on his death-bed, exhorted his son and successor to liberate the serfs. He would have done more justice to the characters of Alexander I. and Nicholas I. had he mentioned the projects for liberation and the actual liberation effected by those sovereigns. The omission tends to intensify the faults of temper and government which he attributes to them.

Mr. Lowe, as correspondent of the London *Times*, was the only English newspaper man admitted to the cathedral at the coronation of Alexander III., of which he gives a vivid and interesting description; and he also saw state festivities in Berlin on the occasion of a visit of the late Emperor (whom he wrongly calls "the Russian Emperor") to the German Emperor. But his information is almost wholly derived from other persons, such as "E. B. Lanin," Mr. W. T. Stead, Prof. Geffcken, and English newspaper correspondents, to whom he always gives due credit. That Russian sources of information were not directly open to him we have a right to infer from his anecdote anent Alexander III.'s Teutophobia, on p. 25. Had he known even the Russian alphabet he would not have printed that anecdote, of manifestly German invention; "Woronzoff" is spelled with a *v* in Russian, and *v* is the third letter in the Russian alphabet, not almost the last as here represented. The "supper of sour milk and prostokvasha rusks" (p. 277) proves the same thing. "Prostokvasha [bonnyclabber] and rusks" was the statement of Dr. Zakharin, as printed officially in the Russian press; "prostokvasha rusks" being non-existent.

The question is, to what degree is an Englishman, who is totally unacquainted with the language, and but little acquainted with the habits and minds of the Russians, while thoroughly imbued with a British patriotism which approaches violent Russophobism, to be trusted in the choice of his quotations and in the deductions which he draws therefrom? He sets out with an evident desire to be fair, but his style speedily becomes so intense that the reader feels as if his brain were being belabored, and he is physically exhausted. In general it may be said that Mr. Lowe, while *apparently* doing full justice to the late Emperor's fine personal character, good intentions, and, in the main, good performance, contrives to strip him of every virtue. The Emperor's firmness was pig-headed obstinacy; his domestic virtues arose from a phlegmatic temperament; his devout religious faith was superstition; his earnest efforts to do his duty and to attend to all possible details proceeded from a rather absurd idea that God had placed him on the throne, and had for its result merely that his mortal shortcomings and errors are to be reckoned up against him, while his good qualities are to be considered as fit only for a private gentlemen, as concerning his family alone, and as decidedly detrimental to a monarch. There is nothing new or original in this view. It has long been, and will long continue to be, no doubt, the popular and profitable view of the case. Mr. Lowe falls short exactly at the point where all his collaborators and co-thinkers fall short: he fails to explain who placed Alexander III. (and his predecessors) on the throne, and what standard we are bound to adopt, for ourselves and others, in lieu of the vital importance of developing high personal character and devotion to duty with what talents we may chance to possess, as we have been exhorted to do by Christian preachers and pagan philosophers. To cap the climax, Mr. Lowe presents us with this problem: Alexander III. kept the peace of Europe simply because he was a coward ("his physical courage was never of the highest"); he twice did his best, despite this cowardice, to bring about a war; and the real peacemakers were the German Emperors and Bismarck—which would seem to leave the author's much-admired Germans (p. 312) also under the imputation of cowardice.

What Mr. Lowe says, on p. 117 and elsewhere, about the Franco-Russian alliance and interchange of naval visits is good. The best-informed Russians who were placed near the Emperor, at the time of the famous visit of the French fleet to Cronstadt, did not hesitate to designate the affair as a "farce." As Mr. Lowe shows, the responsibility for the farcical element did not lie with Alexander III. or the Russians. His statement of the Jewish question in general is fair, and the retort of the *Novoe Vremya* (p. 109) to the English protest on that question is worth noting and remembering. He comes to the just conclusion, after carefully balancing the statements of Mr. Harold Frederic and M. Leroy-Beaulieu, that the question of religion involved is only subordinate. It is rather singular, however, that, after describing the "Pale of Settlement" for the Jews as being nearly eight times the size of England and Wales, and quoting the Guildhall memorial about 5,000,000 Jews being "pent up in narrow bounds," it should not have occurred to him to explain what hardships are endured by the 29,000,000 inhabitants of England and Wales, as compared with those endured by 5,000,000 Jews in a tract eight times as great.

In quoting the famous case of Prince Barclay de Tolly, whose action in having his children baptized in the Lutheran Church (his wife being an Orthodox Russian) entailed his dismissal from the Guards and the army, Mr. Lowe is evidently not aware that it was an isolated, not a representative, case. It is a fact that there were, among the court officers of the late Emperor, Lutherans married to Orthodox Russian women, whose children were brought up as Lutherans without let or hindrance. When Mr. Lowe characterizes the Russian Church as "the embodiment of the most debased and spurious form of Christianity," he is plainly ignorant of the close kinship, almost identity, of the Russian and the Anglican-Catholic or Ritualistic branches of his own national church. When he speaks (p. 189) of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Baltic provinces as "the old Teutonic Fatherland," he forgets the significant bit of Russian history that exposes the manner in which the Knights of the Teutonic Order conquered those provinces with sword and blood, imposed on the inhabitants—who still speak dialects of a language not even cognate with the Indo-European family to which both German and Russian belong—a German aristocracy and the German tongue. He does admit, in a quotation from Mr. Pobedonostzeff (whose Russification of these provinces he strongly disapproves, as if it were the first instance of the sort, instead of the second, in their history), that "Protestantism, as represented by the Livonian Knights, was equally animated by secular motives." Mr. Pobedonostzeff is sound in his history at least.

Blind faith in "E. B. Lanin" leads Mr. Lowe into another pitfall of misunderstanding. Lanin asserts (p. 198) that the Russian officials are considering the advisability of keeping down the pride of the peasants by treating them as an inferior class and addressing them as *thou* and *thee*, instead of by the more respectful *you*. As a matter of fact, that form of address has always been in use, not only from master to serf, from landholder to free peasant, and between the peasants themselves, but also from peasants to the gentry, in token of familiar affection and respect; just as a high ecclesiastical personage on the most solemn occasions, or a peasant on any occasion, would address the Emperor himself with *thee* and *thou*. Other errors are, that the Grand Duke Constantine, junior, was suspected of complicity in the Nihilist plot which ended in the death of Alexander II.; that the late Emperor's journeys were "hurried and furtive"; that the Grand Duchess Marie Pavlovna was not permitted to accompany her husband, the Emperor's brother, on his tours of inspection, because her beauty and kind-heartedness rendered her popular and made Alexander III. afraid of her influence over the troops. It was commonly understood that the objection lay in the Grand Duchess's persistent efforts to win influence by begging the troops to address her as "Aunty Molly."

Mr. Lowe's statement of the Battenberg-Bulgaria complication is clear and good. So is his summary of all that is known of the young Emperor, Nicholas II., though, as in the case of his father, it is still too early to pronounce judgment with absolute authority; and his epitome, drawn from the Russian papers, of Alexander III.'s great funeral progress through Russia and his magnificent burial services. It is a pity that he omitted to reproduce the touching details, mentioned by the Russian papers, of the sorrowing throngs of peasants who knelt and wept as the train passed throughout the length of the land, and who stood patiently in line for days to kiss the hand of the dead Emperor in farewell.

While his claim that England, rather than Russia, was the peace-keeper in 1877 is too weak to discuss, Mr. Lowe records the state of affairs at that time clearly and well, with a few exceptions. His English is often of the awkward, fantastic sort known as "newspaper English," which is unworthy of a serious history like the one he has attempted, and, on the whole, written: "To worsen"; "the officers shouldered high the Prince"; "gave the loose to"; "his preaching caught on"; "it was here where." On p. 107 "1889" should read "1890."

DE MÉNEVAL'S MEMOIRS.

Memoirs Illustrating the History of Napoleon I. from 1802 *to* 1815. By Baron Claude-François de Méneval, edited by his grandson, Baron Napoléon-Joseph de Méneval. With portraits and autograph letters. 3 vols., 8vo, pp. xxi, 421, 484, 545. D. Appleton & Co. 1894.

It may be true that a man is never a hero to his valet; if this is so, between valets and private secretaries there is a great gulf fixed. As time goes on, the private secretary becomes entirely moulded to his master's will, and follows him with doglike fidelity. Of all those who were attached to the first Napoleon in close personal relations, no one seems to have surpassed the Baron de Méneval in exhibiting the peculiarly canine virtues. The blood of a race of courtiers filled his veins. The terrors of the Revolution came and went before he was out of the nursery; and when he was old enough to seek a vocation Napoleon's name and fame were already filling France. Amiable, well-bred, light-hearted, but honest and loyal, a dilettante in literature, and neither too philosophical nor too inquisitive, De Méneval was fitted to be the favored servant of either a Bourbon or a Bonaparte. When his acquaintance with Napoleon's brothers brought him in 1802 a summons to the presence of the First Consul, the young Baron betook himself to the Tuileries in such a shiver of mingled fear and exultation as his grandfather may have felt in the halls of Versailles.

There was nothing republican about young De Méneval. "Napoleon," he wrote in deferential phrase, "condescended to receive me with a kindness which at once dissipated the respectful awe in which I stood." Napoleon took his measure in one keen glance, walked up to him, pulled his ear, and said: "Come back to-morrow morning at seven and come straight here." Such was "the conversation," said the Baron, "which preceded my admission into this sanctuary, which I imagined as a sort of place from which nothing but invisible oracles proceeded, accompanied by lightning and thunder." Henceforth De Méneval was installed at Napoleon's desk. Shortly afterwards he succeeded the more famous Bourrienne, whose alleged memoirs he rejects as mainly spurious, and he remained hidden within Napoleon's shadow until the Corsican himself passed into permanent eclipse at St. Helena.

De Méneval could not divest himself of the habits that had become his second nature. He had acquired a kind of proprietary interest in what seemed to him to be the glory of Napoleon. During the rest of his existence he lived upon the remembrance thereof, and it appears that this remembrance is still the treasured inheritance of his posterity. Napoleon foresaw that the scribe would never be able to shake off his office:

"The Emperor said to me one day: 'In the order of things I must die before you. When I am no more, what will you do? You will write.' I was not prepared for this thought of death thus unexpectedly expressed, and Napoleon seemed to me immortal. As I did not answer him immediately, he added: 'You will not be able to resist the desire to write memoirs.'"

De Méneval did live on with pen in hand. He helped to inspire Thiers to write his chauvinistic history of the Consulate and Empire, and before his own death in 1850 he produced the story which fills these three volumes and fulfils Napoleon's prophecy.

The value of these memoirs is scarcely proportional to their bulk. They contain neither inspiring narrative nor profound analysis. The Baron was incapable of either. It is impossible to compare them with the thoughtful memoirs of the Chancellor Pasquier, and they do not contain a trace of the spice that enlivens the reminiscences of the Rémusat family. The volumes may serve to show, what we knew before, that Napoleon elicited a blind, unquestioning devotion from civilians as well as soldiers. Unstinted adulation and extravagant panegyric are the warp and woof of these books, and the tone often becomes very shrill. Thus, in the preface, we read:

"The revelations which time will bring will show Napoleon raised on the summit of greatness by means of which morality approves; they will show him *free from all baseness, straightforward, magnanimous, exempt from low passions*, endowed with every kind of courage, constantly occupied with the care of ameliorating the condition of humanity."

From one end of his story to the other the Baron will not admit a single shadow upon his hero.

"The consciousness of his own strength rendered recourse to oblique and mysterious ways unnecessary for him; in matters of politics at home and abroad he often proceeded with a frankness which was sometimes pushed to the extreme of brutality; his honor and his sentiments of personal dignity would never allow him to have recourse to deceit or corruption."

Can the Puritan philanthropist whom the Baron thinks he knew be identical with the man who kidnapped and murdered the Duc d'Enghien, who despised and habitually insulted women, who seduced Mme. Walewska, who contemptuously belittled the sacrifice of a million of men to his own ambition, who filled his diplomacy with lies, and relied constantly upon the aid of those spotless advisers, Talleyrand and Fouché?

Moreover, De Méneval is impressed by Napoleon's heartfelt piety.

"Bonaparte was sincerely religious; I may add, a true Catholic." "His habit of involuntarily signing himself with the cross, . . . his expectation of help from above at a decisive moment in his battles, the religious ideas which the sight of a church or the sound of church bells awoke in his mind, his taking refuge in the consolations of religion during his last moments at St. Helena—do not all these things testify to his faith in Providence?"

In this connection the Baron forgets his own testimony to Napoleon's marvellous truthfulness. "When he attended in Egypt the religious ceremonies of the Mohammedans, his faith had not changed in the slightest degree. He was acting in the interests of a clever and well-matured policy." The Baron's zeal to show Napoleon's religious fervor is quite untrammelled by limitations of language. Thus he writes: "When Napoleon wrote to the Directory that, having seen at the moment of landing in Egypt a sail which he believed to belong to one of the enemy's ships, he had implored Fortune not to desert him, but to grant him five days more, he mentally translated the word 'Fortune' by 'the Almighty God.'"

Contradictions in Napoleon's language or character are all resolved for this eulogist and perplex him not, but possibly De Méneval's labors over Napoleon's correspondence taught him how to keep his right hand in ignorance of the deeds of his left. The translator kindly sets up a mark at all places where De Méneval's story is at variance with itself, and the signals are numerous. One illustration will suffice: De Méneval says that Napoleon never saw Bourrienne after October 20, 1802. Yet the next sentence runs on thus: "When, in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1805, the Emperor, forgetting his offences, appointed him plenipotentiary minister to Hamburg, he granted him the usual audience, but did not add to this favor any return of his old friendship." Such discrepancies, though slight, must cast doubt upon the author's carefulness and upon his methods of composition, especially on account of the repetitions of negligence.

Nevertheless, with all this scribbler's weaknesses, his inaccuracy of statement, his needless and monotonous narrative of campaigns, his superficial judgment, and his irrational hero-worship, these volumes are not entirely devoid of interest. The reader watches for the testimony which the servant gives concerning the life of his master. De Méneval could not well avoid telling some things about Napoleon in his moments of relaxation, when the Emperor had lapsed into the Corsican soldier. Not all the Baron's rhetoric can conceal the confirmation which he unwittingly brings to the sarcastic strictures of enemies like Mme. de Rémusat. No less striking are the illustrations of Lombroso's theory that Napoleon, like so many other men of genius, was the victim of partial insanity. Thus, Napoleon was unreasonably fitful in mood and abnormally sensitive where such weakness would be least expected. Wax models of human organs caused in him such spasms of nausea that he had to abandon the study of physiology, yet he never shrank from the gory sights of a battle-field. He was so irritable as to be liable to nervous convulsions which were perhaps associated with epilepsy, and he was correspondingly fickle in temper. "When excited by any violent passion, his face assumed a terrible expression. A sort of rotary movement very visibly produced itself on his forehead and between his eyebrows, his eyes flashed fire, his nostrils dilated." He fell into a furious rage with De Méneval because a parcel was not punctually delivered, and "scolded," wrote the Baron, "with so much volubility that I was unable to get in a single word." This recalls Napoleon's more famous tirades against the English ambassador and against Talleyrand. Shortly after, the tempest blew completely over, and Napoleon greeted the Baron again as his "dear little Méneval." He covered his peevishness with a characteristically shrewd observation, "There are circumstances in which it is necessary for me to put my confidence in quarantine."

Again, the Baron witnesses to Napoleon's megalomania. He was always proclaiming his superiority to the limitations recognized by other men. Even in little things he wished to show himself superior to all others. He found Marie Louise making an omelette, and at once took possession of the utensils in order to show her how the thing ought to be done. The result was what might have been expected; the dish was speedily spoiled. Although he had an abnormal power of memory of details, yet he invariably increased the totals of the rosters of his battalions, apparently wishing to believe that his resources were even greater than they were. He was, however, curiously incapable of performing simple computations correctly. Like Monge, who could solve abstruse mathematical problems with ease, but could not work out a simple algebraic equation, Napoleon quickly understood difficult questions in mathematics or strategy, but could rarely find the true total of a sum in addition. This strange illiteracy manifested itself in other ways. Some words he could never spell correctly. Thus "cabinet" was always "gabinet," and "afin que" was always "enfin que." The act of writing was painful to him, and he seldom had the patience to complete his sentences. Even then his script was usually illegible even to himself. Once with infinite pains he wrote an autograph letter to his Hapsburg father-in-law, but De Méneval's pen had to trace the lines after him.

Another imperial habit, interesting to alienists, was Napoleon's sleeplessness and irregular habits of nocturnal labor. "It sometimes happened that I would hand him some document to sign in the evening. 'I will not sign it now,' he would say; 'be here to-night at one o'clock or at four in the morning; we will work together.'" "I used to find my writing-table in the morning covered with reports and papers annotated in his writing."

One of the best portions of the Baron's story is his description of the means employed to alienate Marie Louise from Napoleon after the latter was sent to Elba. The Baron was, in effect, Napoleon's representative near the Archduchess after she passed once more into Austrian hands. Helpless, he beheld the skilful manœuvres by which her natural attachment for the father of her child was checked, undermined, and finally diverted entirely to another object. One can almost see the woman's character change. She had become partially French, but the original Austrian was wonderfully restored. This story of metamorphosis has small political importance, but its human interest is considerable. One cannot help admiring the lively old grandmother of the Archduchess, who counselled her to tie her bedsheets into a rope, let herself down from the castle window at night, and run away to Elba.

The translation is indifferently well done by Robert H. Sherard. Readers are warned at the outset that the translator has tried to give a literal rendition in order to reveal the man—as though there was anything in De Méneval that was worth revealing! Even this announcement would scarcely excuse such unnecessary sentences as these: "The sovereign of Sweden comes to be dethroned," and "The discussions of the umbrageous and speculative minds who dominated in the National Tribune."

The Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford. By Henry Parry Liddon, D.D., late Canon of St. Paul's. Edited and Prepared for Publication by the Rev. J. O. Johnston, M.A., and the Rev. Robert J. Wilson, D.D. In four volumes. Vol. III. Longmans, Green & Co. 1894.

THE period covered by this volume of Dr. Pusey's biography—from 1845 to 1858—his biographers consider the most important of his life, and they are probably right. Newman, until his secession, was the recognized leader of the Tractarian Movement. After his secession, Pusey took his place, and his influence was immense both in Romanizing the Anglican temper and in keeping those whom Newman had Romanized with the help of Pusey and others in the English Church. Twice he did more than any other to prevent a stampede to Rome—once after the secession of Newman, and again after the decision of the Gorham controversy in a fashion hostile to the Romanizing party. The constructions advocated by Newman in "Tract 90," if not now the dominant constructions of the English Church, enjoy a legal security equal to any others, and an ever-widening influence and acceptance; and for this Pusey deserves more praise or blame than any of his contemporaries. In 1858 the battle was not ended, nor the victory gained, but the hardest fighting had been done.

However important the period from 1845 to 1858, both for Pusey and the Church, its history is far less interesting for the reader than that of the years when Newman was upon the stage and took the leading part. It is hard to say why Pusey is so much less dramatic a figure than Newman, but of the fact there is no doubt. Newman never was subjected to a tithe of the humiliations and rebuffs that were visited upon Pusey by his ecclesiastical superiors. If he had been, he would not have delayed his march to Rome so long. The temper of the two men was very different. Newman had a great hankering for authority, but was quick to feel and to resent its bond. Pusey, with far less self-assertion, kissed the smiting rod, and went about to discover in himself some secret fault which had deserved the punishment.

In this volume of 488 pages we have first an account of Pusey's early efforts for the establishment of Anglican sisterhoods, and next an account of his earlier relations with Samuel Wilberforce, who succeeded the more placable Bagot as Bishop of Oxford. Nothing could better illustrate a certain innocence in Pusey than his unsuspicious manner of addressing Wilberforce at the very time when that prelate was scoring him in a private letter in the most merciless fashion. But that he was not wanting in courage or persistency is made evident by his first university sermon after his long suspension. He began where he had left off, retracting nothing. It was characteristic that he attributed his suspension to some secret sin. For so good a man his sense of sin was always morbidly acute. One must be far gone in ascetic piety not to be more amused than edified by the chapter which records Pusey's struggle with Keble to get him to confess him and furnish him with a penitential scheme of life. Even Keble, always more rich than Pusey in saving common sense, and not without a little worldly wisdom, cannot repress a smile. One of Pusey's self-denials was to leave his mail for a while unread. Keble confessed that for him that would be self-indulgence. He also suggested that Pusey's resolution not to smile might be harder for others than for himself. As for his stern repression of all humor, that could not have been a difficult penance. His resolve "to drink cold water at dinner as only fit to be where there is not a drop 'to cool this flame,'" is possibly ambiguous, but it is probably meant to reflect upon himself and not on the water. His endeavor to dissociate Keble his confessor from Keble his friend is strange and sad: "If I might ask, do not shake hands, or—anything of this world." But the kindness of his heart came out in his begging Keble not to follow his example, lest the hard bed, and hair shirt, and third-class cars, and the eating of unpleasant food by preference, should be injurious to his health.

Pusey had one penance that was not of his own choosing. He had built the Church of St. Saviour's, Leeds, with his own money as a penitential gift to God. It proved a source of terrible perplexity to him, a nest for Romanizing clergymen, who, hatching all sorts of vagaries, aroused the opposition of their rector and their bishop, and finally, with one exception, went over to Rome in a body. The Gorham controversy drags its slow length through seventy pages. Before this began, Manning had been suspicious of Pusey's sympathy with Newman and had warned him of his fears. But the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Gorham decision that baptism has no magical efficacy for the extirpation of original sin drove Manning and many others into the Roman Church, while apparently Pusey never so much as thought of going with them. His was the patience of hope. He felt sure that in course of time all things would work together for the good of those who believed that every formal declaration of the Roman Church, except that of her primacy, might be accepted by the Anglican without prejudice to his standing in the Church of England. All the anxieties and dangers of the Gorham controversy flared up again in 1853 in the case of Archdeacon Denison, who, condemned by the Diocesan Court of Bath and Wells for preaching the doctrine of the Real Presence of Christ's body in the sacramental bread and wine, successfully appealed to the Court of Arches and the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, but on purely technical grounds. Keble's caution throughout this controversy is instructive as compared with Pusey's more straightforward conduct. It is interesting to conjecture what their course would have been if the Privy Council had confirmed the judgment of the local court. It is not likely that they would have been driven to Rome. Their instinctive devotion to the Church of England was sufficient to outweigh a hundred logical considerations, and they were always rich in expedients for saving themselves from the practical conclusions involved in their patristric theology.

Pusey's position was one of painful isolation through the whole period covered by this volume of his biography, but the year 1850 was that in which his isolation was the most complete and his burdens greater than seemed possible for him to bear. In this year his bishop condemned not only his special errors, but his general ministry, as doing "more than the labors of an open enemy" to wean Anglican believers from the faith and ritual of their church. An elaborate correspondence ensued, and Pusey was shortly inhibited from preaching in the Oxford diocese. Keble was the only friend from whom he got much comfort. Gladstone advised apology for certain adapted Roman books of devotion, and Pusey's brother held his nose to the episcopal grindstone in a remorseless way, even being so superserviceable as to prepare a form of retraction for him to sign. In the event Pusey's "relentless gentleness" prevailed over Wilberforce's indignant wrath, the inhibition was withdrawn, and in a few years Pusey found himself preaching at St. Mary's on the invitation of his bishop. It would be difficult to exaggerate the debt which Catholic Anglicanism owes to Pusey's patience, meekness, and long-suffering. But it is certainly a question whether he would rejoice very much to see our day, when so much of the Hegelian honey has gone into the Tractarian hive, as Mark Pattison said, and the High Church theologians of Oxford are developing a Biblical criticism from which the writers of 'Essays and Reviews' would have drawn back with suspicion and alarm.

Women's Work. By A. Amy Bulley and Margaret Whitley. With a preface by Lady Dilke. London: Methuen & Co.

THE facts and statistics systematically grouped in the first two chapters of this volume leave no room for doubt that, in England, women have already gained a foothold in the higher professional and business occupations. The Englishwoman's problem, it appears, is now not to get acceptance of her service from a public that understands its value, but to secure in return for it a rate of payment that shall insure her a fit standard of living in her particular walk in life. If she can succeed in obtaining an equal rate of remuneration with men for equal work, her difficulty, it is claimed, will be in a fair way of solution. This statement is, of course, not applicable to the woman of exceptional talent or ability, but to the rank and file of workers, for whom, for an indefinite time to come, the only hope of securing a fixed and fair reward is by coöperation and organization among themselves. Thus, by way of illustration, although Mrs. Humphry Ward is said to have received £18,000 for 'David Grieve,' the earnings of women writers in general are such that the projectors of the "Authors' Club" excluded them on the express ground (endorsed by Mr. Walter Besant) that they could not afford to pay the subscription —the "Writers' Club" for women being the fortunate outcome of this refusal. Again, although a head-mistress may, in London, receive £300 and upwards per annum, the average assistant mistress gets the cramping stipend of £125 to £150, while assistant masters in similar posts get £140 to £170; and further, although "even in the Established Church the propriety of women preaching appears to be regarded to some extent as an open question," and in any case women preachers seldom fail of a congregation, "an item no church can afford to disregard," such preachers have not been found sufficiently worthy of their hire to make quotation of their remuneration possible. In still another field, although an isolated case is cited of a woman having set up for herself in business as a jeweller, the conclusion is that if women wish to gain a footing in artistic crafts that require an apprenticeship, "they must conciliate opposition by showing that they have no intention of underselling their fellow-workmen."

While in the crowded textile and other trades involving employment in factories, women do the same kind of work as men, "and are almost equally skilled," the rate of wages they accept in suicidal competition with men, in combination with their unorganized condition, suffices to turn their presence in the industrial world into a threat against the possibility of a decent standard of life for the British working classes. Low wages and lack of organization are shown to be interdependent conditions—women in the bookbinding trade, for instance, having been declared, like the journalists, unable to pay the subscription to men's associations (their wages seldom being more than half the men's) even should provision be made for their admission. The first step towards overcoming both conditions at once is the formation of temporary trades-unions among women themselves. Already numbers of such unions, dating from the efforts of Mrs. Emma Paterson in 1874, have been formed. The difficulties of organization among the lower grades of workers, rendered spiritless by overwork, fearful of dismissal at the first step towards independence, and ill able to spare from the pittance earned even the small sums needful for organization, are enormous. Nevertheless encouraging results are detailed. In certain cases, as of the cotton-weavers, men unionists have had the foresight to bring women into their own organizations, with the result that wages have become equal, while the fatal element of competition between men and women has been eliminated. A reasoned belief in mixed unions, as the ultimate form, is the natural outgrowth of the principle laid down by Lady Dilke that "the highest interests of women in every sphere of life are indissolubly bound up with those of men, and any attempt to deal with either separately is fraught with danger to the State and to the nation."

A point insisted on, and illustrated by the case of shop assistants, is that it is impossible for outsiders to reform trade abuses; shops which have been forced, by Consumers' Leagues and the like, into providing seats for assistants, having, by systems of fine, reprimand, and dismissal, rendered the seats useless. The only sure means of reforming grievances is pronounced to be combination among workers, backed by judicious legislation. The need for further legislation in regard to sanitary conditions, hours of labor, the employment of children, and of mothers with infants, is set forth at length. The last, however, is the only class of women for whom special legislation is desired, and Lady Dilke notes that whatever sacrifice of personal freedom women may be called on to make, they make ultimately for the sake of their own hearths and their own children. Factory laws are urged on the principle that "trade must adapt itself to what is necessary for the workers in regard to their health and requirements as human beings," not that "human beings must adapt their standard of health and leisure to the conveniences and exigencies of trade."

It is a paradoxical fact that combination among the women of England has been confined to the lower classes of workers. The cultured classes have formed no organization fulfilling the purposes of a trades-union, while the "corporations by which professional and commercial men secure the maintenance of a definite system of employment and a fixed standard of payment have no parallel among workers of the other sex." Whatever may be the causes of the blindness of the more intelligent women to their own interest, this is a volume well adapted to relieve it, since it relies for its force on inference from fact, and is free from both the cant and the mawkishness that sad experience has taught readers to expect from literature designated by the feminine noun.

Hours in My Garden, and Other Nature-Sketches. By Alexander H. Japp, LL.D., F.R.S.E. Macmillan. 8vo, pp. 340. Illustrated.

THE personal impressions, observations, and some results of reading, with which this volume is filled, are very interesting indeed. The work relates to the old country, from Devon to the Tweed, and has more than a hundred sketches, like little windows through the pages, each a delight of the artist, looking out upon the bits of England and Scotland described within: scenes from the gardens, the hedgerows, the wood, the stream with its rapids and its bridges, and the castles with their towers, in ruins or hiding their grayness under the ivy. The birds and the beasts and the people are not just those to which we are accustomed, but they call up our own for comparisons by similar, yet decidedly different, traits and surroundings. The author is one of the most accurate of the natural-history essayists; his idealizations are not too far from the truth for recognition, and his enthusiasm is not intemperate. Of the popular writers there are few who stay so close to the facts; because of this his reader is led to feel more as if actually going over the route to gather in the things worth seeing and remembering. The text is full of life and poetry; apt quotations from favorite poets are abundant, and are used

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with good effect. But, with due reverence for Shakspere, Milton, Keats, Campbell, and others, it must be agreed that some of the stock expressions common in popular writing, threadbare as they are, out at elbows or crippled in recital, add little to strength or originality in composition—"Mice and rats and such small deer," "fresh woods and pastures new," "a dim religious light," "a thing of beauty is a joy for ever," "distance lends enchantment," etc.

Quoted observations, like the author's own, are usually weighed with care, which of course contributes much to the attractiveness of the volume. Several of his second-hand notes, such as that on the bird diving to thirty fathoms from the surface, for instance, should perhaps be accepted with allowances. Suggestion of a critical disposition, and readiness in its exercise, appears also in his references. He touches up Burroughs for inability to discriminate between rooks and crows, and again he wrings the heart out of the gushing description of "A hunt for the nightingale" by remarking that it was rather too late for the song, and "it is even very doubtful if that five minutes' song which Mr. Burroughs did hear was, after all, the song of the nightingale, seeing that the song by that time has so many imitators; and it does not appear that Mr. Burroughs saw the bird which gave the short shower of notes he set down as those of the nightingale." While Dr. Japp certainly was wide awake in "Up in the morning early," there is reason to suspect it was much nearer his regular bedtime when he wrote the account of that excursion, since the statement "As we pass on we meet a shepherd driving his charges thus early out to pasture, whistling as he goes, *his face shining from hardly yet effaced ablutions*," is followed, a little farther along, by "And so we close our morning ramble of fully two hours—not having met or seen a human being." The encounter with the bull, coming after, may have put the shepherd out of mind.

Sea Yarns for Boys, Spun by an Old Salt. By W. J. Henderson. Harper & Brothers. 1895.

A STORY is current in the naval service that, years ago, during the late war, one of the many improvised men-of-war commanded by an officer of the volunteer navy was noted from the fact that over the door of the cabin—a cabin of a man-of-war being judicial chamber as well as quarters—were inscribed the words, "Who enters here leaves hope behind." In the same way 'Sea Yarns for Boys' might have had the phrase "Who enters here leaves fact behind" inscribed upon its covers. This is not meant as a reflection, since the yarns belong in the domain in which Frank Stockton enjoys such peculiar preëminence. The writer, in fact, deserves great credit for his powers of imagination; but in addition praise should be given for his keen observation of the many and varying phases of the sea and its surroundings, and the happy facility he has in describing them. We are quite sure the book will be found amusing and interesting by the boys, and such yarns as "The Long Yacht Race," "The Peaceful Pirates," and the "Queendom of Girlica" not only will amuse older people in their lighter moments, but are especially creditable to the yarn-spinning powers of the author.

Those who have followed the sea many years will recognize, with some exaggeration, the language of the forecastle of the old days—the days of single topsails and long cruises in the merchant service, the days that marked the "sailors" of past years as distinguished from the "seamen" of the present. The author is not unfamiliar with men-of-war either, especially their externals; but he is not, we think, in that respect to the manner born.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Balfour, A. J. The Foundations of Belief. Longmans, Green & Co. $2.
Bassett, George. Hippolyte and Golden-Beak. Harpers. $1.25.
Beale, Maria. Jack o'Doon. Henry Holt & Co. 75 cents.
Besant, Walter. Beyond the Dreams of Avarice. Harpers. $1.50.
Bonner, Hypatia Bradlaugh. Charles Bradlaugh: A Record of his Life and Work. 2 vols. London: Unwin; New York: Putnams. $8.40.
Bosanquet, Bernard. A Companion to Plato's Republic for English Readers. Macmillan. $1.75.
Carruth, Hayden. The Adventures of Jones. Harpers.
Chinaman, J. C. Bright Celestials: The Chinaman at Home and Abroad. London; Unwin; New York: Putnams. $2.40.
Cortina, R. D. French in Twenty Lessons. Book First. R. D. Cortina.
Craddock, Charles E. The Phantoms of the Foot-Bridge, and Other Stories. Harpers. $1.50.
Currie, Frances L. A Breath of Suspicion. F. L. Webb.
Dictionary of Scientific Illustrations and Symbols. W. B. Ketcham.
Dunckley, Henry. Bamford's Passages in the Life of a Radical. 2 vols. London: Unwin; New York: Putnams. $2.80.
Elshemus, Louis M. The Moods of a Soul. Buffalo: C. W. Moulton.
Fowler, W. W. Summer Studies of Birds and Books. Macmillan. $1.75.
Geikie, Sir Archibald. Memoir of Sir Andrew Crombie Ramsay. Macmillan. $4.
Ginnell, Laurence. The Brehon Laws: A Legal Handbook. London: Unwin; New York: Putnams. $2.40.
Good Reading about Many Books. Mostly by their Authors. London: T. Fisher Unwin.
Haliburton, Hugh. Furth in Field: Essays on the Life, Language and Literature of Old Scotland. London: Unwin; New York: Putnams. $2.
Haynes, E. J. A Farm-House Cobweb. Harpers. $1.25.
Howells, W. C. Recollections of Life in Ohio from 1813 to 1840. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke Co. $2.
Johnston, Elizabeth B. George Washington, Day by Day. The Cycle Publishing Co. $2.50.
Kean, Sydney. Both Worlds Barred. London: Unwin; New York: Putnams. $1.40.
Knight, E. F. Rhodesia of To-Day: A Description of the Present Condition and the Prospects of Matabeleland and Mashonaland. Longmans, Green & Co. $1.
Lawrence, Rev. E. A. Modern Missions in the East. Harpers. $1.75.
MacNeill, J. G. W. Titled Corruption: The Sordid Origin of Some Irish Peerages. London: Unwin; New York: Putnams. $1.40.
Magill, Mary T. Pantomimes; or, Wordless Poems. E. S. Werner. $1.25.
Matter, Force and Spirit. Putnams. $1.
Memorial Volume, University of Pennsylvania. Boston: Ginn & Co. $1.10.
Menzies, John. Our Town and Some of its People. London: Unwin; New York: Putnams. $2.40.
Pinto, Prof. William. The Literature of the Georgian Era. Harpers. $1.50.
Nihilism as It Is. London: Unwin; New York: Putnams. $1.40.
Ogle, Arthur. The Marquis D'Argenson: A Study in Criticism. London: Unwin; New York: Putnams. $2.90.
Peck, Prof. H. T., and Arrowsmith, Prof. Robert. Roman Life in Latin Prose and Verse. American Book Co. $1.50.
Robinson, H. P. Men Born Equal. Harpers. $1.25.
Sargent, C. S. The Silva of North America. Vol. VII. Lauraceæ—Juglandaceæ. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.
Schelling, Prof. F. E. A Book of Elizabethan Lyrics. Boston: Ginn & Co. $1.25.
Ten Brink, Prof. Bernhard. Five Lectures on Shakspere. Henry Holt & Co. $1.25.
The English Abroad. London: Unwin; New York: Putnams. $1.40.
The Schoolmaster in Comedy and Satire. American Book Co. $1.40.
The Yellow Book. Vol. IV. London: John Lane; Boston: Copeland & Day.
Townsend, E. W. Chimmie Fadden, Major Max, and Other Stories. Lovell, Coryell & Co. 50 cents.
Tucker, Elizabeth S. Famous Queens and Martha Washington Paper Dolls. F. A. Stokes Co.
Twain, Mark. Pudd'nhead Wilson and Those Extraordinary Twins. Hartford: American Publishing Co. $2.50.
Tyler, Prof. Moses C. Three Men of Letters. Putnams. $1.25.
Wagner, Leopold. Manners, Customs and Observances: Their Origin and Signification. Macmillan. $1.75.
Warren, Lillie E. Defective Speech and Deafness. E. S. Werner.
Wise, T. J. Spenser's Faerie Queene. Book I., Part III. With illustrations by Walter Crane. London: George Allen; New York: Macmillan. $3.

HENRY HOLT & CO., N. Y.

HAVE READY:

TEN BRINK'S FIVE LECTURES ON SHAKESPEARE.

Translated by JULIA FRANKLIN. 12mo, gilt top, $1.25.

A HISTORY OF THE NOVEL

PREVIOUS TO THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY. By Professor F. M. WARREN. 12mo, gilt top, $1.75.

JACK O'DOON.

An American Novel by MARIA BEALE. Second Edition in press. (Uniform with "The Prisoner of Zenda.") 75 cents.

The story of a great sacrifice, with stirring episodes on land and sea. The scene is the coast of North Carolina. The climax is original and impressive.

SLUM STORIES OF LONDON.

(NEIGHBORS OF OURS.) By H. W. NEVINSON. (Uniform with "The Prisoner of Zenda.") 75 cents.

"A book which runs the gamut of human emotions. . . . Didacticism is entirely absent."—*Public Opinion.*

NOW READY.

THE FOUNDATIONS OF BELIEF.

Being Notes Introductory to the Study of Theology.

By the Right Hon. ARTHUR J. BALFOUR, M.P.

Crown 8vo, $2.00.

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.,

PUBLISHERS,

15 East 16th Street, New York.

FOR SALE.

New York Review, Vols. 1-10, bound..... .....$10 00
Engineering Magazine, Vols. 1-7, Nos..... 10 00
Riverside Magazine, Vols. 1-4, Nos..... 4 00
N. E. H. and G. Register, Vols. 1-8, 10-12, cloth .. 22 00
H. WILLIAMS, 195 West 10th St., N. Y.

YALE MIXTURE.

The choicest tobacco made, and pre-eminently a gentleman's smoke.

Marburg Bros., The American Tobacco Co., Successor, Baltimore, Md.

COPELAND AND DAY,

69 Cornhill, Boston.

"BALLADS AND SONGS."

By JOHN DAVIDSON.

Octavo, $1.50.

Grant Allen has written of "The Woman Who Did," and the title suggests that John Davidson may fitly be called "The Man Who Dares," for certainly some of his themes and some of his lines, in this his latest book, are among the most daring in modern literature. One closes Mr. Davidson's book with reluctance and with a haunting sense of beauty and power, and the promise of yet greater things to come. Happily he is not faultless—since for the faultless there is no perspective of hope.—LOUISE CHANDLER MOULTON *in Chap Book.*

"A RANDOM ITINERARY."

By JOHN DAVIDSON.

Octavo, $1.50.

A volume of Essays, with Title-page and Frontispiece by Lawrence Housman.

A captivating little book of English origin, that seems as one reads it to exhale the odors and reflect the hues of the fields and the hedgerows, parks and gardens, through which its author leads us, is John Davidson's "A Random Itinerary."—*Chicago Dial.*

To readers who enjoy whole chapters of minute description of field, forest, and sky, the book may be most cordially recommended, for Mr. Davidson writes with magnetic enthusiasm, and his style is remarkably vivid and agreeable.—*San Francisco Chronicle.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED